

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. L

NOVEMBER, 1952

NO. 1079

The Spiritual Aspect of Foreign Policy

EDMUND A. WALSH, S.J.

*Regent, School of Foreign Service,
Georgetown University*

*Address delivered at Colgate University's Conference on American Foreign Policy,
Hamilton, N. Y., July 27, 1952.*

SEVEN years of steady, planned conquest since 1945 have resulted in a new Communist Empire,—the greatest in recorded history—with some 800 million human beings now directly or indirectly subjected to the control of the Kremlin. That means one-third of the human race—and the end is not yet in sight. In terms of space and geography, nearly 500,000 square miles have been added to the previous domain of the modern Genghis Khan in Europe, with more than 4 million newly added to his resources in Asia. This profound transformation, with its social and geographical consequences, makes the Russian Revolution of 1917 the most important single political event since the fall of the Ro-

man Empire in the 5th century of the Christian Era.

What the world is witnessing, and what American policy-makers must cope with, is not a conventional or localized upheaval involving this or that nation. They are facing a dynamic world crusade designed to recast all humanity in the image and likeness of a new god, a new culture and a new paganism, in which the dignity of human personality is to be weighed and computed solely on the scales of economic productivity and collectivized agriculture.

In implementing our foreign policy and in the conduct of our diplomacy one intangible must never be permitted to disappear under the frequency and pressure of surface prob-

lems. The basic issue between Soviet Russia and the United States lies between two great moral opposites, not on the 38th parallel in Korea, or along the frontiers of the several occupied zones of Europe, or in the controversy over the re-arming of Germany. The conflict is between two interpretations of man's nature and ultimate destiny; it will arise wherever men exist and the Communist agitator appears. The spiritual faith entrusted to Christendom, though often dishonored by thoughtless men, by unworthy fascinations of the flesh and by other earthy enticements, still remains the anchor of stability for the West against the rising tide of Soviet imperialism and the distortions of Communist humanism.

MARXIST VIEW OF MAN

To the Marxists, man is merely an organic compound of physical and chemical elements, a more highly developed species of animal that walks upright, endowed with special faculties and showing much ingenuity in the use of tools. But he has no spiritual character or immortal destiny. His main function is to produce material commodities for use or for exchange; his highest satisfaction should be to serve as a master tool or a machine for the political and economic purposes of the omnipotent state.

Weighed in that scale of values he

is better than a dog but often not so valuable as a horse or a tractor. He may be cunning as a fox in utilizing the horse for increase of crops. He may be capable of turning out a dynamo for a war plant, or operating a combine on a collective farm. But in the final reckoning of Soviet calculators, it is the grain that counts on the agricultural front, and the manufactured commodities sweated out of his labor that make the worker an economic asset.

It is not his manhood that commands respect, nor any obligation to revere his inalienable rights. He becomes a faceless cog on the wheel of collectivized man, a category, a type, not an individual soul. There is no intrinsic dignity of human personality nor image of the God-head on his brow. If he turns rebellious against exploitation of his body, or becomes a "deviationist" from the "party line," he perishes in one of the periodic purges or disappears by millions behind the silent curtain of some distant concentration camp.

To be sure, there have been cynics, agnostics, atheists, slave drivers and Machiavellis since the world began. They have appeared individually and as groups in Catholic communities, in Protestant states and in other social units. But this is the first time in recorded history that atheism as a philosophy of government has the support of a powerful sovereign

state,
teeth
its a
worn
Union
encir
one o
of re

Sov
schol
main
expan
curre
ism,
natio
chara
the F
centu
truth
differ
ful f
know
impa
Comm
prece
So
coinc
many
ampl
ports
and
Balti

The
Pr
pa
ma

state, which is still arming to the teeth for international application of its anti-God revolution. The shopworn pretext of defending the Soviet Union against a mythical "capitalist encirclement" no longer fools anyone capable of adding up a column of realities.

A NEW IMPERIALISM

Some commentators, even some scholars in the field of history, have maintained that the present Soviet expansion is due basically to a recurrence of the old Czarist imperialism, and must be met by the diplomatic and military maneuvering that characterized England's duelling with the Russian Empire during the 19th century. This viewpoint is a half-truth that misses the depths of the difference. There are new and powerful forces at work which were unknown to the Romanovs and which impart a driving power to world Communism wholly absent from the precedents.

Soviet ambitions do, in effect, coincide with old Russian policy at many geographical points—for example, in the urge for warm-water ports along the periphery of Europe and Asia, in the Balkans and on the Baltic. Constantinople and control of

the Dardanelles are common objectives. But no Russian Czar entertained the messianic vision of the whole world aflame with social revolution. No imperial government accepted the teachings of Karl Marx as handbook for international policy and the diplomatic career. No cabinet ministers of old Russia had an anti-God program which was to be systematically imposed wherever Russian power gained the upper hand. No dialectical materialism figured in their philosophy of world history, and certainly no dictatorship of the proletariat was discernible in their social thinking.

It is the presence of these specific novelties which makes the Communist drive for world domination a wholly new phenomenon in the modern world. Historically, it is comparable to the conquests of Genghis Khan and his hordes in the 12th century, the Moslem invasion of Europe in the 8th century and the Turkish menace to Christendom which was halted at Lepanto in 1571.

Who shall say that the West is without sin in this hour of confrontation between spirit and ideals on the one hand, and armed materialism on the other? The wanton flirting with irreligion during the exuberant natu-

ralism of the 19th century; the excesses of the Industrial Revolution, with its neglect of social justice; the arrogance of cold rationalism; the scepticism of shallow thinkers in a position to influence public opinion; the joyful sniping at moral values from academic chairs, followed by corruption in high places—all this free-wheeling softened the fibre of thought in undisciplined minds and paved the way for the totalitarians of the 20th century. Men were encouraged to have light opinions on everything and firm faith in nothing—except in the impossibility of faith in anything.

But the Communists never lost confidence in their own brand of certitude, opposing, as they did, to the treason of countless intellectuals, the loyalty and persistency of sworn revolutionists. The bourgeois demolition squads in philosophy, art, letters, education and religion delighted in blowing up the bridge between man and his higher destiny. They crippled man at the very nerve centers of spiritual perceptivity—and now blame their victims for limping. The sophisticates had their day for a hundred years and now they have their pay. They may be appalled; they should not be surprised. Prophets of negation and enemies of any absolute in law and duty, they created a moral vacuum which Hitler tried to occupy; but Communist power

prevailed and populated the void with Marxist ideas. The ideas, with cold logicity, have now blossomed into tanks, warplanes, submarines, artillery—into concentration camps behind iron curtains in Central Europe and bamboo curtains in the Orient.

To an incredible ignoring of Soviet objectives must be added some downright cowardice in facing them. Thus, on one recent occasion, a committee of the United Nations was engaged in drafting a Declaration of Human Rights and sought to embody Jefferson's phrase that all men are created equal. The alert Soviet delegate protested against the use of the word "created." Obviously, that verb implied the existence of a Creator, which would run counter to Communist dogma. The committee watered their text down to: "All men are born equal"—and the ghost of Lenin was appeased.

STATEMENTS OF MR. KENNAN

I must confess also to considerable surprise at certain statements of our present Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mr. George Kennan. I am acquainted with Mr. Kennan personally and have much respect for him, as few men know Russia better than he does. But in his latest publication, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*, published in 1951, a train of thought is found that seems in flat

contradiction to the public policy expressed by a long line of American presidents, statesmen and secretaries of state.

Urging more realism in our foreign policy and less idealism, Mr. Kennan recommends that American foreign policy-makers abandon what he describes as "the legalistic-moralistic approach to international problems." He further hopes that we refrain from "moral appraisal" and cease "making ourselves slaves of international law and morality." Since an honest adherence to international law and observance of the moral law, even by governments, has been a constant theme in American state papers and in the official denunciations of the last German Kaiser, his successor Adolf Hitler and the present dictator of Soviet Russia, one is puzzled—to put it mildly.

Self-interest, obviously, has been and will continue to be a weighty factor in every international decision of every government. But Mr. Kennan is prepared to go much further and favor the position of those who maintain that there is no place for the concept of right and wrong in judging the actions of a sovereign state. He holds as untenable "the assumption that state behavior is a fit subject for moral judgment."

Now, what acts in international relations is not the huge, complex entity called a state, but a selected

group of individual men called a Cabinet, a Supreme Council or a Politburo. The claim is that what might be immoral or criminal in the individual suddenly achieves a mysterious immunity when conspirators band together and act in unison as a government. This is the old Austinian creed of absolutism. In practice it leads straight back to the ethics of the jungle and was actually pleaded as defence for Hitler's extermination of 6 million Jews and the horrors of Dachau, Buchenwald and Auschwitz.

I am still more puzzled when I recall that Mr. Kennan, in his celebrated article in *Foreign Affairs*, for July, 1947, ended that penetrating analysis of Soviet conduct with a measured warning that the entire security of the American people depended "on their pulling themselves together and accepting the responsibilities of moral and political leadership that history plainly intended them to bear." He urges a sense of gratitude to Divine Providence for the "implacable challenge" presented by the Kremlin to American society. "To avoid destruction," he writes, "the United States need only measure up to its own best traditions and prove itself worthy of preservation as a great nation." That is why I am publicly asking Mr. Kennan what he means by now arguing that Stalin is not subject to the moral laws of the whole human race?

The issue will certainly not be successfully met by physical power alone, though power is of prime importance, since it is the only argument the Politburo respects. But such a solution will leave the roots of the infection uncured, no matter in what direction the fortunes of battle may incline.

Since the Soviet objective is domination of the minds and souls of men, as well as conquest of their territory, the warfare, whether hot or cold, may be expected to persist throughout an unpredictable number of years. There was once a Thirty Years War in Europe and a Hundred Years War at an earlier date. The duration and form of the present tug-of-war should be more discernible in the near future as the balance of power becomes more computable.

If confidence in our American heritage and faith in the nobility of human destiny be not the mainspring of our resolves and the rock of our diplomacy, we shall be crippled in our endeavors to meet the real challenge. Korea is one of the fields of battle and a symptom; it is not the cause of the conflict. Without such clarity of vision and understanding of the values at stake, we doom ourselves to be forever facing a ruthless adversary with the right hand of spiritual conviction tied behind our back, and wielding only perishable weapons with the left.

A precarious and fragile truce may be contrived from time to time, in response to the logistics of the moment. But such an interlude is poor foundation for enduring peace. International law is only a control; it is not a cure of evil, unless it reaches to the sources of human motivation. Arms alone cannot guarantee that inner steadiness and tenacity of purpose which made England greatest in her darkest hour. Even a technical knockout of our enemy, or a decision on points, or containment of his assault, will not suffice, though we may gain some respite and easier living.

Talleyrand once put the heart of the matter to Napoleon in a celebrated warning: "You can do anything with bayonets, Sire, except sit on them."

If the primacy of the spirit be not vindicated over Communist materialism and Soviet despotism by men who are still free, the natural yearning for peace in tired hearts and the professional zeal of diplomats to report an agreement can become seductive fallacies that could end in surrender of the supreme principle of moral survival. Awareness of what is at stake and what could be lost is the first condition of a satisfying victory. The horrors of modern warfare, though ghastly beyond all previous tragedies, are not the worst alternative now confronting Christendom and Democracy.

PAU
stri
roundi
challen
the pul
Freed
publica
Cathol
(Harpe
Jews,
tected
tricks,
his cur
until n
going
O'Neill
pressin
tics, bu
mixed
spirit
function
rampar
truth,
hated.
Thou
O'Neill
answer
that it
the lat
could l
Blansh

Blanshard Brought to Book

THE REV. JOHN S. KENNEDY

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

PAUL BLANSHARD, for all the strident bugling of triumph surrounding his name, has not gone unchallenged in the interval between the publication of his book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, and the publication of James M. O'Neill's *Catholicism and American Freedom* (Harper, \$3.50). Protestants and Jews, as well as Catholics, have detected his errors, his disingenuous tricks, his barbarous prejudices and his curious reasoning processes. But until now no one has done a thoroughgoing job of debunking him. Mr. O'Neill, then, has met a major and a pressing need, not merely for Catholics, but for America as a whole, a mixed society which must have a spirit of brotherhood to survive and function and which is now beset by rampant poison in the form of "untruth, ignorance, suspicion and hatred."

Though remarkably extensive, Mr. O'Neill's book is not an exhaustive answer to Mr. Blanshard, in the sense that it does not examine and refute the latter's work line by line. That could be done, but so thick are the Blanshard misrepresentations or mis-

interpretations that it would require a series of volumes as long as that setting forth the tepid adventures of the Bobbsey Twins. What Mr. O'Neill does, and does exceptionally well, is to expose Mr. Blanshard's principal and typical faults of reporting and argumentation, and to discredit (indeed, to pulverize) Mr. Blanshard's claims to scholarly method, objectivity, reliability.

Mr. O'Neill remarks in his preface that "the betrayal of American scholarship by the encomiums heaped on Mr. Blanshard's book has done more to produce what has been called the 'tension' between Catholic and non-Catholic Americans than all of Mr. Blanshard's inaccuracies and insults put together." This is exactly true.

The "Maria Monk" sort of vilification of Catholics was long a profitable racket in this country. But it had gradually grown less reputable and less weighty with all but the literal or figurative hillbillies. Mr. Blanshard revived its sway by publishing a book bursting with quotations and littered with footnotes. Because of the fact that the book was replete with quotations, and the bottom of page after

* New Haven 7, Conn., June, 1932.

page was strewn with footnotes as the shore is with dead fish after a tremendous storm, it was assumed that here was a work of prodigious and impregnable scholarship. Such is the naivete of, and the grip of academic superstition on, innumerable Americans.

A profusion of quotations in itself proves nothing about a book, nor does a profusion of footnotes. The intelligent and responsible reader will want to check the quotations in the original, for accuracy, completeness and context. He will also want to scrutinize the footnotes to determine whether they are in fact relevant and whether they do in fact support the text. I can fill my room with golf balls, golf clubs, golf shoes, golf score cards and other golf gear, but you would have no warrant to say that I do play golf, much less that I play it well, unless you actually saw me at it on the links.

SHOCKING UNSCHOLARLINESS

But it is this last which many reportedly scholarly reviewers of Mr. Blanshard's book failed to do. Because he made a great show of the paraphernalia of scholarship, they assumed that in his writing he was scholarly. And the assumption they presented, in their reviews, not as an assumption, but as a statement of hard, irreducible, incontrovertible fact.

Hundreds of thousands of Ameri-

cans, who would have been more or less proof against the undisguised yahoo attack on Catholics, heeded Mr. Blanshard because of the cachet placed on his book by those whom they understandably, but mistakenly, trusted not to witness to a man's scholarship without testing it. Doubtless there were also those who delighted in having their prejudices supposedly documented. But the regrettable thing, the monstrous thing, is the swindling and betrayal of the reasonably honest mind by men whom ordinary people customarily think to be impartial authorities on the validity of scholarship.

Hence, the heart of Mr. O'Neill's book, and what gives it its insuperable strength, is its devastating demonstration of the sweeping and shocking unscholarliness of what Mr. Blanshard wrote. Not only is the Blanshard book demolished thereby, but also Mr. Blanshard's standing as a witness.

"Mr. Blanshard's basic thesis," says Mr. O'Neill, "is that the Catholic Church is an enemy of American freedom." Does Mr. Blanshard prove that thesis? He does not, he cannot, because it is contrary to readily ascertainable fact. This may be established in two ways, both of which Mr. O'Neill employs. The first is to demonstrate from the record that American history does not show the Catholic Church to be, or ever to have been, the enemy of American freedom. The

second is to demonstrate that the semblance of argument which Mr. Blanshard presents in vindication of the thesis is only a semblance and not an argument.

HISTORICAL RECORD

The first section of *Catholicism and American Freedom* is called "The Historical Record," and comprises three chapters. In these it is recalled that the discoverers, first explorers and first settlers of this continent were Catholics. Colonial days are reviewed, with their bans or disabilities on Catholics in some of the colonies, and, very notably, the Act Concerning Religion passed in 1649 by the assembly (9 Catholics, 5 Protestants) of the only Catholic Colony, Maryland.

This act said:

Whereas the enforcing of conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence on those commonwealths where it has been practiced, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants, no person or persons whatsoever within this province or the islands, ports, harbors, creeks, or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be any ways troubled or molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof within this province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion, against his or her consent.

Of the 56 signers of the Declara-

tion of Independence, Mr. O'Neill points out, one was a Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who later said:

When I signed the Declaration of Independence, I had in view not only our independence from England, but the toleration of all sects professing the Christian religion and communicating to them all rights.

Of the 39 signers of the Constitution, two were Catholics, Thomas Fitzsimmons of Pennsylvania and Daniel Carroll of Maryland, the latter of whom said of the Constitution:

Regarding it, then, from every point of view, with a candid and disinterested mind, I am bold to assert that it is the best formed government which has ever been offered to the world.

It was the first Congress of the Republic which framed the Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to the Constitution, and of its 90 members three were Catholics. Thus began what Mr. O'Neill calls "the consistent record of American Catholic endorsement of our total Constitutional situation. This approval, lay and clerical, has been substantially unbroken for 160 years."

In those 160 years there have been more than 500 Catholic bishops in this country. It is impossible, says Mr. O'Neill, to produce one statement from any one of the 500, or one action by any one of them, in support of the contention that American Catholics oppose American democracy or American freedom.

In the fourteen chapters which make up the second and third sections of Mr. O'Neill's book, Mr. Blanshard's attempts at indicting American Catholics are severally examined. The Blanshard thesis is here more fully stated, before it is shown to be the flimsiest and sorriest parody of argument. "The chief thesis of his book," Mr. O'Neill observes, "is that the Catholic Church is an enemy of freedom because the hierarchy, through the priests, controls the thoughts and actions of American Catholic laymen," imposing on American Catholic laymen a set of ideas and practices alien and inimical to distinctively and characteristically American ideas and practices.

With what do these supposedly clashing sets of ideas and practices have to do? Some samples may be put on display.

CHURCH AND STATE

1. *Separation of Church and State.* Cardinal Gibbons once said:

The separation of Church and State in this country seems to them [American Catholics] the natural, inevitable and best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the State. Any change in their relations they would contemplate with dread. They are well aware, indeed, that the Church here enjoys a larger liberty and a more secure position than in any country today where Church and State are united.

Mr. Blanshard would dismiss this statement as hypocrisy of the sort

habitually indulged in by Catholic prelates. He would instance in rebuttal what he calls the Catholic interpretation of the First Amendment. The only true meaning of the First Amendment, he insists, is to be found in the Rutledge doctrine, first voiced by the late Supreme Court Justice in a minority opinion in the *Everson Case* (1947) and later incorporated in the majority opinion in the *McCollum case* (1948).

The Rutledge doctrine has it that the purpose of the First Amendment was

to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and Civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. . . . The prohibition broadly forbids state support, financial or other, of religion in any guise, form or degree.

Authorities on constitutional law were dumbfounded by this doctrine, for the actual wording of the Amendment merely prohibits Congress from establishing any religion as the official national religion. Mr. O'Neill examines the historical background of the amendment, the circumstances of its composition and the writings of the Constitution-makers, to prove that such indeed is the sole intent of the framers and the wording of the amendment. He shows, too, that the very Congress which drew up the Amendment proceeded to set up Chaplaincies for Congress and the army, to appoint that Federal funds

be spent to spread Christianity among the Indians, etc. He indicates, further, that every President, and every Congress since, have acted on the understanding that the First Amendment does not bar impartial aid to religion. And surely he would have made much of Justice Douglas' opinion for the majority in the recent decision upholding "released time" as not violating the First Amendment, had that case been decided before the completion of his book.

So that Mr. Blanshard is utterly wrong in maintaining a) that the Rutledge doctrine is the immemorial and only truly American interpretation, and b) that dissent from that doctrine is an exclusively Catholic and wickedly anti-American phenomenon.

DEMOCRACY

2. *Democracy.* Mr. Blanshard asserts that American Catholics do not, and simply cannot, believe in American democracy.

Mr. O'Neill cites statements by Catholic bishops, Catholic scholars, books with the *imprimatur* (taken by Mr. Blanshard to mean that every word therein is basic Catholic doctrine), all of which give that assertion the lie. And it is only an allegation, which Mr. Blanshard cannot prove. His attempts to do so include, for example, the statement that "you cannot find in the entire literature of Catholicism a single unequivocal endorse-

ment by any Pope of democracy as a superior form of government." To which Mr. O'Neill replies: "You cannot find a similar statement about any other form of government." It just isn't the function of Catholicism to establish the superiority of any single political form. In rehearsing the record of American Catholics in the matter of democracy, Mr. O'Neill explodes the Blanshard contention.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

3. *Religious Freedom.* Mr. Blanshard says that American Catholics are bitterly opposed to religious freedom, but conceal this fact while still a minority. Once they are in the majority, he predicts, they will act ruthlessly for the suppression of such freedom. How does he know that? Why, he says, just look at the Catholic countries of the world.

In handling this pseudo-argument, Mr. O'Neill calls attention to a study made by Professor M. Searle Bates, of Union Theological Seminary. The study deals with constitutional provisions for religious liberty and actual practical conditions of religious liberty in 79 of the principal states and areas of the world. It shows that in constitutional provisions for religious liberty Catholic states are somewhat better than Protestant states and others, and that in actual conditions of religious liberty Catholic and Protestant states rate about the same.

Hence the Blanshard notion is shown to be no more than a Blanshard notion. Moreover, Mr. O'Neill notes that Mr. Blanshard always makes Spain the Catholic norm, whereas, in fact, there are Catholic countries, like Belgium and Ireland, which, in religious freedom, have a policy altogether different from Spain's.

EDUCATION

4. *Education.* Mr. Blanshard has it that Catholic schools are un-American and anti-American, and this for two reasons.

The first is a paraphrase of Dr. Conant's recent reference to "the American principle of a single public school system for all children"; Mr. Blanshard calls it "the accepted American theory that education is primarily the function of the people." "The people" is Blanshardese for a numerical majority which can impose its will on all others and which sets a rigid pattern to which all others must conform exactly and unprotestingly.

The accepted American theory (as recognized, for example, in the Supreme Court's decision in the Oregon school case) is that education is primarily the right of the parent, and history shows that the religious school has, from the start, been a feature of American life.

The second reason alleged against Catholic schools is that they are divisive. Here again Mr. Blanshard and Dr. Conant are agreed. Neither

offers any proof for the conclusion; there is none. But, whereas one might have expected Mr. Blanshard to impose an arbitrary interpretation on objective fact, one is a little surprised that Dr. Conant, a scientist, should be so flagrantly unscientific.

SOCIAL POLICIES

5. *Social Policies.* Mr. Blanshard declares that the hierarchy controls the Catholic vote, and that that vote is invariably conservative or reactionary. Mr. O'Neill says: Look at the New Deal and Fair Deal majorities run up in the big cities, or look at the records of Catholics in Congress. As to the second, he summarizes studies made of the voting records of Catholics in the 79th, 80th and 81st Congresses. The studies show a) that Catholic members differ markedly in their votes, some being extremely conservative, others middle-of-the-roads, others extremely progressive; and b) that Catholic members as a whole cast a far larger number of votes for progressive measures than does the Congressional membership as a whole, or a group of Congressmen almost identical in all respects save religion.

MEDICINE

6. *Medicine.* Mr. Blanshard says that the Church tells physicians and surgeons what they *can* or *cannot* do. Mr. O'Neill shows that this is not so. The Church is, like every other reli-

gion, a teacher of morals, and lays down principles indicating what, in cases involving moral problems, physicians and surgeons *should* or *should not* do. There is a great difference between a moral code (which the Church has and teaches) and a medical code (which, despite Mr. Blanshard, the Church does not have or teach).

The samples of Mr. O'Neill's exposure and refutation of Mr. Blanshard's contentions on specific issues raised by Mr. Blanshard could be multiplied. Of greater importance, however, is Mr. O'Neill's showing up of the shoddy Blanshard method in general.

The Blanshard method of argumentation is strange and wonderful. In essence it is, as Mr. O'Neill says, assumption plus repetition. In this it is highly reminiscent of Hitler's method of argumentation, as set forth in *Mein Kampf* and exemplified daily in his infamous career.

Also, Mr. Blanshard keeps hammering away with a word to which he gives a sinister connotation (for instance, "hierarchy"), and uses words and phrases loaded with emotion and prejudice (for instance, the Holy Father is the "Commander-in-Chief of the Catholic army").

Again, Mr. Blanshard will twist or edit facts out of all recognition. He maintains, for example, that the hierarchy opposes expanding social service at the hands of the government.

His proof? The fact that the National Council of Catholic Nurses opposed the Murray-Wagner-Dingell public health bill "ostensibly on the ground of excessive government control. Catholic hospitals might be compelled to drop their sectarian medical code if they came under Federal supervision." But if the hierarchy did indeed oppose expanding social service at the hands of the government, why did the Messrs. Murray, Wagner and Dingell present the bill in the first place, since all of them are Catholics and, therefore, (according to the Blanshard view) absolutely controlled by the hierarchy?

Still another feature of the Blanshard argumentation is to adhere to utter contraries on different pages—saying on one page that the hierarchy controls all Catholics absolutely, and on another that only about one-half of American Catholics pay much attention to their bishops; or saying on one page that no Catholic parent is allowed to send his children to public schools, and on another that the majority of American Catholics send their children to public schools.

Mr. O'Neill shatters the myth of the Blanshard documentation. Again and again, he shows that key assertions are totally undocumented, as, for example, that the Church claims "complete territorial jurisdiction." Other key assertions are "documented" with such vague and worthless phrases as "some Catholic writers

Hence the Blanshard notion is shown to be no more than a Blanshard notion. Moreover, Mr. O'Neill notes that Mr. Blanshard always makes Spain the Catholic norm, whereas, in fact, there are Catholic countries, like Belgium and Ireland, which, in religious freedom, have a policy altogether different from Spain's.

EDUCATION

4. *Education.* Mr. Blanshard has it that Catholic schools are un-American and anti-American, and this for two reasons.

The first is a paraphrase of Dr. Conant's recent reference to "the American principle of a single public school system for all children"; Mr. Blanshard calls it "the accepted American theory that education is primarily the function of the people." "The people" is Blanshardese for a numerical majority which can impose its will on all others and which sets a rigid pattern to which all others must conform exactly and unprotestingly.

The accepted American theory (as recognized, for example, in the Supreme Court's decision in the Oregon school case) is that education is primarily the right of the parent, and history shows that the religious school has, from the start, been a feature of American life.

The second reason alleged against Catholic schools is that they are divisive. Here again Mr. Blanshard and Dr. Conant are agreed. Neither

offers any proof for the conclusion; there is none. But, whereas one might have expected Mr. Blanshard to impose an arbitrary interpretation on objective fact, one is a little surprised that Dr. Conant, a scientist, should be so flagrantly unscientific.

SOCIAL POLICIES

5. *Social Policies.* Mr. Blanshard declares that the hierarchy controls the Catholic vote, and that that vote is invariably conservative or reactionary. Mr. O'Neill says: Look at the New Deal and Fair Deal majorities run up in the big cities, or look at the records of Catholics in Congress. As to the second, he summarizes studies made of the voting records of Catholics in the 79th, 80th and 81st Congresses. The studies show a) that Catholic members differ markedly in their votes, some being extremely conservative, others middle-of-the-roads, others extremely progressive; and b) that Catholic members as a whole cast a far larger number of votes for progressive measures than does the Congressional membership as a whole, or a group of Congressmen almost identical in all respects save religion.

MEDICINE

6. *Medicine.* Mr. Blanshard says that the Church tells physicians and surgeons what they *can* or *cannot* do. Mr. O'Neill shows that this is not so. The Church is, like every other reli-

gion, a teacher of morals, and lays down principles indicating what, in cases involving moral problems, physicians and surgeons *should* or *should not* do. There is a great difference between a moral code (which the Church has and teaches) and a medical code (which, despite Mr. Blanshard, the Church does not have or teach).

The samples of Mr. O'Neill's exposure and refutation of Mr. Blanshard's contentions on specific issues raised by Mr. Blanshard could be multiplied. Of greater importance, however, is Mr. O'Neill's showing up of the shoddy Blanshard method in general.

The Blanshard method of argumentation is strange and wonderful. In essence it is, as Mr. O'Neill says, assumption plus repetition. In this it is highly reminiscent of Hitler's method of argumentation, as set forth in *Mein Kampf* and exemplified daily in his infamous career.

Also, Mr. Blanshard keeps hammering away with a word to which he gives a sinister connotation (for instance, "hierarchy"), and uses words and phrases loaded with emotion and prejudice (for instance, the Holy Father is the "Commander-in-Chief of the Catholic army").

Again, Mr. Blanshard will twist or edit facts out of all recognition. He maintains, for example, that the hierarchy opposes expanding social service at the hands of the government.

His proof? The fact that the National Council of Catholic Nurses opposed the Murray-Wagner-Dingell public health bill "ostensibly on the ground of excessive government control. Catholic hospitals might be compelled to drop their sectarian medical code if they came under Federal supervision." But if the hierarchy did indeed oppose expanding social service at the hands of the government, why did the Messrs. Murray, Wagner and Dingell present the bill in the first place, since all of them are Catholics and, therefore, (according to the Blanshard view) absolutely controlled by the hierarchy?

Still another feature of the Blanshard argumentation is to adhere to utter contraries on different pages—saying on one page that the hierarchy controls all Catholics absolutely, and on another that only about one-half of American Catholics pay much attention to their bishops; or saying on one page that no Catholic parent is allowed to send his children to public schools, and on another that the majority of American Catholics send their children to public schools.

Mr. O'Neill shatters the myth of the Blanshard documentation. Again and again, he shows that key assertions are totally undocumented, as, for example, that the Church claims "complete territorial jurisdiction." Other key assertions are "documented" with such vague and worthless phrases as "some Catholic writers

say," or "Catholic writers frequently say," or "as one Catholic writer has said." Who? Where? When?

Taking a specimen chapter, "How the Hierarchy Works," Mr. O'Neill quotes Mr. Blanshard's statement: "Wherever possible I have let the Catholic hierarchy speak for itself," and then shows that exactly two bishops are allowed to speak in the course of 32 pages with 51 footnotes. Out of 51 footnotes, 45 "do not support any of the sweeping statements and insinuations against the American hierarchy and other Catholics which constitute the bulk of this chapter." The six remaining footnotes have something to do with how the hierarchy works, but none of them supports Mr. Blanshard's allegations.

Mr. O'Neill demonstrates, too, that, in his documentation, Mr. Blanshard quotes out of context and sometimes flatly misrepresents the sources he is supposedly drawing on.

In short, the reliability of Paul Blanshard irrecoverably ceases to exist as Mr. O'Neill puts his work under the microscope. Nor is this the extent of Mr. O'Neill's service. In addition, he gives long quotations from Protest-

ant and Jewish reviewers of the Blanshard book, reviewers who discerned Mr. Blanshard's errors as well as his aversion to genuine religion.

True Americanism, for Mr. Blanshard, is a national religion of arid secularism, with the spiritual eliminated and the dictatorship of the statistical majority established in all fields, morals included. This is not, and never has been, an American ideal. Most Americans, of the past and of the present, would, if squarely confronted with it, horrifiedly repudiate it. But Mr. Blanshard confronts them with it only obliquely, by an attack on his fictitious version of American Catholicism. Mr. Blanshard's quarrel with Catholicism comes down to this—that Catholicism is a supernatural religion (not an ethical culture society) and a universal religion (not a nationalist or department-of-the-government religion). Hence his assault on it—an assault which will not be successful, thanks in part to the work of Mr. O'Neill, for whose perspicacity, good sense, even temper, industry and skill in argumentation there are no adequate words of praise.



Faith is a gift of God. But God does not force this gift upon anyone unwilling to accept it. The mind of man must reach out for it and, having received it, strengthen and fortify it by studying diligently the divine truths which are its object. The kind of faith which can stand the assaults of the world, the flesh and the devil is not blind. It has a strong element of active and perceptive intellect in it.—THE CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, *Hartford, Conn.*, Aug. 14, 1952.

Modern Catholic Historians

GRAHAM JOHNSTON, M.A.
Auckland University College

Reprinted from ZEALANDIA*

HISTORICAL writing is flourishing in England today. Growing numbers of serious readers are eschewing fiction and turning to history, biography, memoirs and diaries for entertainment and instruction, and their wants are being met by a group of writers of whom many, if not careful scholars themselves, can at least tell a story faithfully and with some distinction of style.

It is interesting to note that several Catholics stand high among contemporary English historians, and indeed the general temper of recent historical writing shows a marked difference from that of the days of Coulton and Strachey.

If we omit Christopher Dawson, whose work will be considered in another article, probably the outstanding Catholic historian is the authority on medieval monastic history, David Knowles, who holds the chair in medieval history at Cambridge.

In his two great works, *The Monastic Order In England* and *The Religious Orders In England*, Knowles shows complete mastery of the com-

plex details of the story of the early monasteries, and his scholarship recalls that of the Germans in its meticulous accuracy and inclusiveness. But, unlike them, he possesses a felicitous style and can bring to life many a dull set of facts, while his treatment of the literature written by the monks is better informed than that of several literary critics.

Knowles' two great works are especially attractive when he is writing of the major figures like Anselm and Dunstan, and he would have made an excellent biographer. This impression gains strength when we read his introduction to the posthumous collected essays of another Catholic medievalist, R. A. L. Smith.

Smith, who made his own the study of the agricultural economy of the monasteries, died a few years ago in his late twenties, and it is the opinion of the former Master of Trinity, the eminent historian, G. M. Trevelyan, that by his death English medieval studies suffered a severe loss.

As we read David Knowles' account of his life, it becomes clear also that

* 2 St. Patrick's Square, Auckland C.I., New Zealand, May 29, 1952.

English Catholicism lost an exemplary convert, for in all of his studies R. A. L. Smith was a true Catholic scholar, and it is not surprising that he was yet another who held St. Thomas More in great veneration. For the general reader, Smith's most interesting works are his history of the city of Bath and a useful account of the Church's social teaching, *The Catholic Church And The Social Order*, which he wrote during the war. These both lie outside his special field, but are scholarly and easy to read.

David Mathew, in common with Knowles and Smith, has a most readable manner. This historian, whose full title is Archbishop David Mathew, Apostolic Delegate to British East and West Africa, is perhaps better known to New Zealand readers by his novel *The Mango In The Mango Tree*. This book, whose intriguing title is borrowed from a line of T. S. Eliot, has had considerable popular success, but it hardly ranks with Mathew's historical work, which is of the first class.

This includes the best history of the Church in England since the Elizabethan Settlement, *Catholicism In England*; a sensitive, cleverly written account of the early life of Acton, *Acton: The Formative Years*; and two studies of England in the late 17th century, *The Social Structure In Caroline England* and *The Age Of Charles I*.

The former of these studies was

first delivered before the University of Oxford as the Ford's Lectures. The invitation to Mathew to lecture on this foundation sets the seal on his work as a historian, and there is little doubt that of Caroline England he knows more and writes better than anyone else.

Archbishop Mathew's prolific output also includes a short history of the British Navy, in which he served as a midshipman, and a work on the impact of the Reformation on the contemplative life written in collaboration with his brother Gervase, a Dominican, who also has some reputation at Oxford as a medievalist.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD

Apart from medieval studies, the special interest of Catholic historians (and readers) has often lain in the Reformation period, and here the work of Father Philip Hughes is deservedly well known. Father Hughes, who has held a position as archivist at Westminster Cathedral, is another painstaking scholar who makes his sole aim the uncovering of truth. Like Knowles he has had to master an immense amount of data, and is often found disputing the minutiae of this period with Constant and Janelle, the major Continental authorities.

Perhaps because of this necessary attention to detail, Hughes cannot always be readable; but while he does not possess the easy manner of a Mathew, he is far from dull. Indeed,

his *History Of The Church*, in four volumes, provides us with a very handy account of the development of Catholicism from the Apostles to the Church of today. This work has also been digested by its author into one volume entitled *A Popular History Of The Church*, which succeeds fairly well in its difficult task of observing due proportion and clarity over a long period.

GOOD BIOGRAPHIES

Here, perhaps, may be included two good biographies by writers who are not professional historians. Evelyn Waugh's *Edmund Campion* was written 20 years ago. Like the rest of its author's work it achieved immediate acclaim, and was awarded a major literary prize for the best biography of the year. It has worn better than much of his fiction, so that it is still read and enjoyed by a new generation of readers.

Waugh's supple, economical prose, his ability to sketch a character quickly (and mordantly) and a real insight into Campion's period—all these make for a memorable book. While Robert Speaight's *Thomas à Becket* can hardly be said to equal it, this life is yet another well-contrived and well-written biography, which gives much enjoyment, as well as information, in the reading.

We do not ordinarily class Monsignor Ronald Knox among the historians, but with the appearance of

his long work *Enthusiasm* he takes as high a rank among them as he does among contemporary satirists, apologists and translators.

Enthusiasm, a study of a type of religious attitude common in 18th- and 19th-century England, and found also long before, will put future historians heavily in its debt, for Knox shows that he understands the mind of these times as well as anyone, and his remarks have a relevance which extends far beyond the history of belief.

Enthusiasm took many years to write—it was its author's constant leisure-time occupation—and it takes a long time to read, but it is a joy to all who want English prose at its best. Indeed, with this history to set beside his magnificent translation of the Scriptures, there is a good deal of evidence to say that Knox is the greatest living writer of English prose.

The historians and biographers here discussed are accompanied by others whose value is considerable if not outstanding. But more important than the existence of a number of eminent Catholic writers is the general temper of historical writing in England today. Where one could expect historians of the past either to misunderstand or misrepresent religious belief of whatever kind, today there is evidence of a new spirit of insight and accuracy.

Non-Catholic historians of the reputation of Arnold Toynbee and Herbert Butterfield show the desire for truth, the moderation, the absence of rancor which mark the true Christian historian, and they are only two among many. This fairness among

non-Catholics, together with the improved standards of scholarship among Catholics, makes much contemporary history particularly congenial, especially as it has so many distinguished stylists among its adherents.



Crusade for Christ in the East

Francis Xavier stood at the beginning of an era which has come to an end only in our own day. The Portuguese Empire was only thirty years old when he landed in India to begin his flaming apostolate. It is interesting to note the similarity between the location of those first Portuguese footholds in Asia and the last crumbling outposts to which the West still clings today.

Four centuries ago the Portuguese held the key to the Persian Gulf in the port of Ormuz, a handful of seaports strung along the coast of India, the strategic fortress of Malacca, controlling the Singapore Straits, and the fortified outpost of Ternate in the Molucca Islands. Now in our own time we have seen the colonial powers of the West gradually withdraw from their entrenchments in the East. India, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia and the Philippines are now independent nations. The last footholds of the West are a few French and Portuguese coastal cities in India, British Malaya, North Borneo and Sarawak, Portuguese Timor, French Indo-China and the China ports of Hong Kong and Macao. The day of colonial power in Asia has ended.

With the departure of the Westerner a new era begins for the Church in those lands. No other region in all the world has been so difficult to conquer, and today we have an added incentive to their winning lest they fall within the Communist orbit. And the inspiration will still be the man who fired Europe to the first crusade, Francis Xavier, the first Jesuit missionary and the Apostle of the Indies.—JESUIT MISSIONS, *New York, N. Y., October, 1952.*

Catholic Social Action

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

*Lecture given at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.,
April 24, 1952.*

ANYONE who ventures to talk on the topic of Catholic Social Action exposes himself to challenges from various quarters, and from two opposing positions in particular. I cite these as examples of extreme positions, so as to clarify my own point of view.

The first is the challenge from the strongly social-minded. They demand that Christianity justify itself by its sincerity and vigor in dealing with urgent social problems. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is to be considered primarily as a program of dynamic action, and a man to be a Christian only in so far as he shows himself relentlessly fearless in applying its lessons to the concrete situations of injustice and hate in our daily lives. In its extreme form, such a point of view will demand that Christian teaching and Christian institutions be reduced to a merely instrumental status: the churches are to be simply sounding-boards for the discussion of social questions and planning for specific action.

Such an attitude toward the Gospel arouses enthusiasm among those who are keenly conscious of the pressure of social problems. To see the

power of the Christian church enlisted in the attack on social sin, on inequality, injustice and oppression, gives a tremendous lift to their souls. They have an inexhaustible program for talk and organized activities. On the other hand, such an emphasis on the social implications of the Gospel infuriates those whose interests are affected by it and annoys those who are simply not interested in the topic and find the entire program a disagreeable distraction from what they conceive as religion's real function.

Others demand that Christianity be released from any sort of temporal obligation. As one recent European exponent of this view has expressed it: "We do not like to see the Christian—or Catholic—label attached to organizations engaged in promoting various types of human welfare."

Such people are opposed to the idea of a Christian trade union; to a Christian movement for social security; to the organization of the Young Christian Workers; to the identification of the Church, in short, with any set of activities that would tend toward the improvement of living conditions or the rectification of

social abuses. This, they contend, is strictly the function of the world of secular activities, and they are specially annoyed by anything that looks to them like a form of collective Christianity. The evils in the world, after all, are merely transitory, and the Christian lives for eternity. Toward society his function is that of a leaven, through his example and his personality.

It would be easy to amplify these respective points of view. Suffice it to say that both are at variance with what I conceive as Christian social action—in general—and Catholic social action in particular.

DUTY OF CHARITY

The nonfulfillment of social obligations by Christians is not of itself a judgment on Christianity; it is a judgment on the failure of Christians to live up to the implications of their faith. Many Christians are woefully ignorant of their obligations toward society, whether in the larger or the narrower sense; and one would prefer to excuse people on the ground of ignorance than accuse them of bad faith. Only ignorance would seem to explain the strange pronouncements of some of our lawmakers, who calmly state that the United States, as a nation, has no obligation to provide aid for the needy peoples of other lands; that good Americanism demands that we should look after ourselves first,

foremost and always. Such persons forget, if they ever knew, that nations, like individuals, carry a duty of charity to other nations, and that such a duty must sometimes be fulfilled at a distinct inconvenience to oneself. This is not utopian internationalism; it is plain Christian ethics.

Where, you will ask me, do I then stand? My position can be summed up in a few propositions.

1. I believe that Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, redeemed mankind in its totality, with all that goes to make up the complex nature of man. Man's nature is essentially social. From birth to death we are dependent one upon the other. We cannot feed, or be clothed, or survive the elements except through the ministrations of our fellowman. What is true in the physical sense is still more strikingly the case in the world of intellect and culture; and most of all in the realm of the spirit. It was the message of Jesus Christ to man, continuing and perfecting the ancient Jewish tradition, that faith should come by hearing, and that brother should help brother toward salvation.

2. I believe, likewise, that Jesus Christ instituted a religion which, in its own inner life and function, is distinctly social in character. Catholics conceive of Christ's Church as a tangible, outwardly identifiable, visible body of human beings, united by a common faith, a common worship

and a unified spiritual government of its own. Interiorly they are united through their corporate union with their invisible Head, the Divine Person of Jesus Christ, and this corporate reunion is continually reaffirmed by the sacramental, and particularly the Eucharistic, life of the Church.

Because of the distinctively social structure of the Church itself I see it as eminently qualified to minister to man's own social nature.

3. Those who would attach the label of Socialism or Socialistic to such a doctrine are as much in error as those who would call a man a reactionary because he believes in man's spiritual nature or in a transcendent God. The confusion of social policy or social reconstruction with Socialism is so gross an error that one would imagine it would no longer be dignified even by the exigencies of political warfare.

Socialism is a broad term that designates a long historical sequence of social theories and practices, ranging from simply a marked emphasis upon the welfare functions of government to the historically classic Socialistic concepts of extreme state centralization of government and economy, militant anti-clericalism, various forms of economic determinism, stress on class warfare, etc.

The clear distinction between this type of concept and that of the Christian social message is the repeated

theme of the major pronouncements in recent decades of Catholic Church leaders, such as the Popes and the bishops of various countries. In every case these leaders make plain that the Church's position cannot be identified with Socialistic statism on the one hand, or with economic liberalism on the other. The Church vigorously vindicates the sacred right of private property. But she also holds that nobody, whatever be his title, through labor or through inheritance or purchase, has an unlimited and absolute sway over his property. He holds it solely in trust from his Creator, and this trust imposes upon him certain sacred duties with regard to his fellowman.

A few days ago I happened to be glancing through a local country paper. Among the names mentioned one caught my eye, that of a wealthy northerner who had come to settle in that southern community, and was fairly prominent in civic affairs. One memory of that man stood out sharply: a remark he passed to me as we once travelled together on a bus. "I have no interest," he said, "in the persons of the people who work on my farm. I am interested in them solely for their monetary value. My only concern is how much labor I can extract from them for what I can afford to pay them."

Doubtless such a man would be astonished that anyone should challenge such a—to him—quite obvious

statement; yet his words, taken at their face value, fly in the face of Christian social teaching; and he can find no escape from his moral predicament by crying out "Socialism." If he knows his error—I can only wonder in that respect—I should not think he would feel comfortable at the Last Judgment.

4. I believe, in accordance with many noted Catholic theologians, that the Church, the great instrument or vehicle of eternal salvation, has, none the less, a distinctly temporal mission. God does not will the unhappiness and disorder of the world; nor does the Church, as the interpreter of His will. God wishes men to attain a reasonable, temperate, let us call it frugal, enjoyment of the fruits of His bounty and of their own God-given ingenuity in this world; and it is man's terrific perversity, led on by the Evil Spirit, that prevents our enjoying them. I am even optimistic enough to believe that man will eventually conquer the anomalies and inhuman dislocations of the machine age; that the Creator has not endowed man with these tremendous powers of communication, transportation and power utilization without a purpose. It is because of the immense potential good in these powers that the Evil Spirit makes such frantic and skillful attempts to create from them the instruments of man's political and spiritual slavery.

5. Finally, I refuse to see a contra-

diction between man's concern for his eternal salvation and the quest of decent living and employment conditions in this world. I have already spoken of the Church's interest even in man's temporal welfare. Of all man's temporal institutions none receives greater attention and care from the Church than the institution of the human family: none is more sacred, none more safeguarded. The family is the root social institution of mankind; the cell, as it were, of human society. Through the family each individual works out his eternal salvation. Men save their souls not as isolated human atoms, but as children of a family, as husbands and wives.

Laissez Faire Policy

For this reason, I cannot conceive how any religious-minded man can be indifferent to the problems of families and adopt towards them a laissez-faire policy. This is not a do-gooding spirit; it is not a fluttery humanitarianism. May I go a step further and say that I believe that the this-worldly, immanentistic emphasis that characterizes so many of our present-day social-minded liberals has had precisely the contrary effect to that which they would have it produce. It has served to confuse the Christian mind, and to create that false identification of genuine social concern with materialistic this-worldliness which Christians, of the unenlight-

ened type that I recently mentioned, have seized upon as an alibi for their own selfishness.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

An instance of blundering on the part of certain liberals would seem to be the fate of the proposed Genocide Convention.

Certainly nothing appears to be a more natural conclusion from the elementary truths of world solidarity, not to speak of universal Christian love and sense of justice, than that we should for once and for all stigmatize the mass deportation of whole nations and the mass annihilation of entire populations as a flagrant international crime. I cannot see how any opponent of the Genocide Convention can face the surviving peoples of Lithuania, Estonia or the other mass victims of Soviet savagery. Yet the obvious merits of the proposed convention have been completely confused by its supposed identification with the totally distinct issue of civil rights. This confusion, as I see it, has been caused by friends and enemies of the Genocide Convention alike, and none will more readily see it continue than the chief experts in the field of genocide themselves, the masters of Soviet Russia. I earnestly hope that, when the election year dust and smoke have cleared away, this issue may yet be made clear.

I have spoken of Catholic social theory, you will say, but what of

Catholic social action itself? Let me state the following briefly in answer to that question.

First of all, and foremost, in our own individual lives. We must, obviously, live as Christians. This, as I said, is not admitting the mistaken idea that the failure of the individual is of itself a judgment on the Christian faith. But that failure is a severe judgment on the good faith of the individual himself. Moreover, that good faith must be enlightened good faith. It is not enough in these days for men to be just vaguely kindly and sincere. Love is the great motive power of social action, but that love must be an intelligent love, a love implemented by expert knowledge and the aid of all the wisdom the world can provide for the solution of our intricate social problems.

In the second place, the strength of religious social action lies precisely in its being religious, with the limitations and the powers that such a sphere implies. I do not believe it is the function of the Church to engage in the purely technical field; to convey, for instance, all the answers to our economic problems, especially when the professional economists so notably disagree, as is only proper that they should. The Church cannot be expected to teach intergroup techniques, many of which require a special study of sociological structure and of social psychology. The Church, however, can and should in-

itiate research in these fields. It should be ready to condemn those theories and usages that are clearly contrary to elementary Christian ideas of justice and charity.

DIFFERENCES AMONG CATHOLICS

Catholics, it is true, differ among themselves on a number of very vital points. We are not agreed, for instance, as to the exact nature of social justice; or as to the moral obligation of certain types of public legislation; or as to the Christian position on the functioning of vocational groups in the industrial order. The issue of co-determination in Germany called up recently heated disputes among German and other European Catholics. Nevertheless, there are broad areas in which there is general agreement, and there religion speaks its own mind.

Though religion is not adapted to speak outside of its own field, it is all the more called to speak a prophetic word in the area which is properly its own: to designate clearly as moral matters those things which are moral in their nature, and to be utterly fearless in so doing.

The Church has not the function of telling people how to run their business; but it has the right and duty to tell businessmen what is right and wrong in the conduct of business; to speak on industrial morality, for employers, trustees, managers, union officials, and so on.

This truth alone is revolutionary to many an American mind.

The Church, likewise, cannot tell an employer whom to hire or fire. But it can tell him, as an elementary principle of ordinary morality, that he is violating the moral code and injuring the institution of the family if he lets his hiring practices be guided not by a man's intrinsic worth and acquired skill but by purely racial, religious or national considerations.

In the third place, Christian social action cannot operate in a vacuum. We in the United States enjoy an unparalleled opportunity to put our social doctrines into effect not by something passed down from on top but by their application at the grass roots in our own communities. I see two great avenues to such an achievement: one is that of intelligent community organization, along the lines which have already proved so fruitful in both large urban centers and small communities in various parts of the nation. The other is through the collaboration of the leaders of the various religious bodies along the lines of those basic moral and religious principles which, thank God, we do still hold in common.

Perhaps I should not use the word "still," as if I were registering a decline and not an ascent. True, there is a terrible decline in moral and religious sense in the United States. But there is also an ascent, and the

ascent will, I think, eventually prevail.

Men are learning that it is bad faith to point to religious divisions as an indication that religion is itself outmoded. Men are learning that religion is not, as it is so frequently and groundlessly asserted, a "divisive" factor in the community. Men are learning that a united community demands men and women of honest religious conviction and practice. Men are learning that the terrible woes that have befallen the world in the last decade are to be traced ultimately to men's forgetfulness of their Creator; that the long and weary pathway back to peace is to be found not in illusory peace promises,

but in a sincere return to the faith of the men and women who founded this country and gave it its laws and institutions.

The village atheist is no longer imposing by his smart jibes; the paunchy figure of Robert Ingersoll, that stands in a Midwestern park landscape, no longer dominates our imaginations. At the same time, the sincerely religious people of this country, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish alike, of all origins and all races, are girding their loins to the fight for truth and liberty that lies ahead. I know no more fruitful sector in that fight than the area of intelligent, religiously motivated Christian social action.



A United Europe

Union among the countries of Western Europe will be difficult to achieve. Excessive nationalism and a history of bitter wars may some day yield to the necessity of union for the preservation of life and liberty. But the old barriers still are up and it will take herculean effort to break them.

Nevertheless, it is good to have Paul Henri Spaak, the Belgian diplomat, remind Europe of the advantage of standing together as against being knocked down one by one. And this is sure to happen if nothing alters the schedule of Communist conquest and absorption. A United States of Europe might well be the final obstacle to the Marxist program. The pattern is there. It has only to be followed to duplicate what the cantons did in the Alps and the colonies did across the Atlantic.

Any advance towards lasting peace among the great European powers will be a long step towards a united world that will certainly merit the blessing of God and the well wishes of all civilized men.—THE CATHOLIC REVIEW, Baltimore, Md., Sept. 12, 1952.

The Marriage Court

BERNARD L. DOHENT

*Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC MIRROR**

IN MANY of our parishes you find a Catholic lady who is divorced. She is regular in her church attendance and receives the sacraments frequently. When word gets around that she is going to be married again, and, more surprising, that the ceremony is going to take place in the parish church, the gossips go to work.

If the woman comes of a prominent family, the gossips will seize upon this fact as an added tidbit. They insinuate that money and influence can buy favors from the Church, favors which are forbidden by her marriage legislation.

The case we have described above was presented to the marriage court of the diocese. The court interests itself only in facts—not circumstantial evidence nor gossip. After minute and searching investigation, the facts became clear. The "husband," a non-Catholic, had been validly married previously. His wife is still living, and no power on earth can break that bond. Hiding these facts, he attempted to remarry while the first marriage bond existed. Therefore, his attempt to marry this Catholic

girl was fraudulent and invalid. Although the ceremony appeared lawful, the couple were never actually married.

When these facts were brought to light, the ecclesiastical court acted. The Church allowed the woman to obtain a civil divorce to satisfy civil law. Then the fictitious union was declared null and void by the marriage court. Since no real marriage had ever existed, the Church declared the Catholic party free to marry. The approaching church ceremony, which had caused such wonder and vicious gossip, was perfectly in order and in conformity with the age-old marriage laws of Holy Mother Church.

Marriage cases, such as this one, demand months of trying labor and hours of secretarial work—and real expense. People who seek these services should, if they are able, help to defray the expenses that are incurred in their behalf. But this offering has nothing to do with the ultimate outcome of the particular case. If the father of the girl described above had been poverty-stricken, the decision would have been exactly the same. A

* 1387 Main St., Springfield, Mass., June, 1952

marriage case is settled on its merits and according to the Canon Law of the Church.

The law is sacred and definite. No decision has ever been handed down which was conditioned by the so-called prominence of the family involved. The rights of the poor are safeguarded in theory and practice. Canon Law—Canon 1914—states that those who are unable to bear the expense of their case “have a right to a reduction of costs, or to have their case tried without cost, if it is deemed necessary.”

STATISTICS

The highest ecclesiastical court, the Roman Rota, presents some interesting statistics. In 1927, 61 cases were decided by the Rota. Of these, 25 were prepared, tried and decided absolutely free of charge. Over a six-year period, 30 per cent of all Rota cases which received a decision favorable to the applicant were without charge.

In 1950, 149 petitions were considered for declaration of nullity. Of these, exactly 100 marriages were found to be valid and only 49 invalid. Of the total, 53 petitions were by persons too poor to pay the legal expenses. These were gladly borne by the Holy See—in spite of great expense and the free services of trained judges and matrimonial lawyers.

Money and prestige have no bearing on the decision of an ecclesiastical

court. Decisions are based on the unchanging law of God. The only concern of the Church is to keep sacred the bond of sacramental matrimony, and to assist souls to achieve their eternal salvation.

The Catholic Church has a juridical organization that compares with that of any state, modern or ancient. For many centuries, in all Christian countries, there existed two classes of public courts, the courts of the king and the courts of the Church. Each was sovereign in its own domain. The king's courts handled all cases touching on the commonweal, the public good; the Church courts took care of all suits that touched on the spiritual.

They functioned side by side. The limits of their jurisdiction were clearly marked, and each respected the competence of the other. For example, Henry VIII was the titular head of the civil judiciary of England. But when he tried to attack the validity of his own marriage, the case had to be tried in a Papal court. So in France, the courts of the Church held equal status with those of the State, until the time of the French Revolution in 1789.

When the old union of Church and State was abolished, the Christian courts lost their legal status, but they continued to function down through the centuries. Their authority comes from God. Therefore, the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts are bind-

ing in conscience, even though an existing civil government may not recognize their competence as a civil tribunal.

No society or organized group can function properly without an internal tribunal to interpret its laws and to settle its domestic issues. This is particularly true of the Catholic Church—the Mystical Body of the Lord. Our society is world-wide: its members populate every corner of the globe. The Church courts came into existence to regulate and unify and coordinate this vast religious body, that its mission might be fulfilled. Also, the existence of the courts of the Church are a boon to good order in any community.

COMPOSITION OF A MATRIMONIAL COURT

In the Diocese of Springfield, Mass., we have such a Matrimonial Tribunal. It is composed of competent judges and officers who, together with learned lawyers, discharge their duties in the same manner as our civil courts. Each and every function and operation of this diocesan tribunal is prescribed by Canon Law.

The court is composed of judges, who are the Bishop, the Officialis, the Vice-Officialis and the Pro-synodal Judges. The Bishop of Springfield has the right to preside over all matrimonial cases. Because of the pressure of his many duties, he usually dele-

gates this power to the Officialis or Vice Officialis.

These officials have the duty of directing trials and deciding what is necessary for the administration of justice in cases pending before the court. Then there is the Promoter of Justice, who is similar to a prosecuting attorney.

The Defender of the Bond is a priest of great skill and prudence whose duty it is to safeguard the sanctity of the matrimonial bond. He must protect and defend the marriage contract until it has been clearly proven that the marriage is invalid, and that no bond exists.

Lawyers skilled in Canon Law are appointed to the court by the Bishop. They assist and advise the petitioning party in the marriage case. The records of each case are carefully recorded by Notaries.

Finally, there is a group of priests, called Consultants and Attorneys, who interview people of the diocese who for one reason or another believe that their marriage is not binding in the sight of God. These priests must decide if the petitioner has sufficient grounds to warrant that the case be presented to the court. If such evidence is found, they will assist the party in preparing the evidence.

Any persons in the diocese involved in a marriage which they believe for any reason to be null and void may present their case to the Matrimonial

Tribunal. They may either write directly for an appointment or ask a priest of their parish to do so for them. The Tribunal pledges itself to examine with kindness and understanding cases presented by the laity and to assist them in their marital difficulties. The tribunal is not a marriage clinic for the solution of unhappy marriages. The court is conducted on the fundamental principle that a marriage once entered upon enjoys the favor of the law unless clearly proved invalid.

The Diocesan Matrimonial Court exists to help souls attain the purpose of the Divine Hand in creating them. It is concerned with justice, and the facts of each separate case are its only interest. It is anxious to exercise charity to one and all within the confines of the Canon Law of the Church. Every soul is of infinite value in the sight of God; therefore, every individual enjoys the same rights before the Matrimonial Tribunal, and is treated with the same respect and consideration.



Via Lund

The reason behind the Greek-Orthodox withdrawal from the Lund (Sweden) meeting of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches probably rests on many motives but one surely substantial element is the futility of multiplying discussions which have no hope of arriving at anything like effective conclusions. The enormous differences which separate the various parties involved present simply unbridgeable gaps and no amount of talking around the subject can bring reconciliation. Those who are most pleased by meetings of this kind are the ones who have nothing to lose from the point of view of Christian doctrine, since they long ago jettisoned its cargo almost totally, but whose respectability is enhanced by association with the older Christian sects who can make some kind of claim to legitimate orders and tradition.

Catholics must never allow themselves, in spite of all this, to appear uninterested in any movement which seeks church unity, and however futile it may appear at the present stage, it is not impossible that what is begun here may move in directions which will some day be salutary for the true faith. The yearning for unity which we see all about us can only be realized, we know, in a return to the historic faith of Christendom. What we do not know is by what paths this return will be accomplished and the Providence of God may this day be directing it home through the city of Lund.—THE PILOT, *Boston, Mass.*, Aug. 23, 1952.

Communism—Enemy of the Free World

Reprinted from the 1952 Report of the AFL Executive Council.

IN THE present world crisis, the international Communist movement is not a political force in the democratic sense of the word. Nor is it an organization dedicated to a social ideal and basic social reform. The American Federation of Labor has never considered Communism—even in its so-called idealistic stage of the first days of the Russian Revolution—as a movement of extreme radicalism. We have always considered it as a dangerously reactionary movement hypocritically hiding behind a facade of revolutionary and high-sounding phrases and organized only for the purpose of serving the aims and interests of the masters in the Kremlin. Today this movement is completely totalitarian and serves only as an instrument and auxiliary of the Russian dictatorship in its policy of military aggression and continuous imperialist expansion.

Though it employs violence as a means to attain and maintain its end, the Communist movement is not strictly or solely military in its form and activities. In our fight against this insidious threat to freedom and peace, we must concentrate on positive non-military activities and measures. In this field of activities, the

AFL has been guided by the premise that Communism is the antithesis and the very negation of every ethical and moral value, of every social advance, of every democratic right and humanitarian viewpoint developed and won by mankind in centuries of hard struggle for the emancipation of man from the rule of caste or class, ignorance and prejudice of every type. That is why there can be no more positive activity or struggle waged by any progressive movement or labor organization than the fight to wipe out all Communist influence, infiltration and organization in the ranks of the workers in particular and among the people in general.

In the days when Nazism was the most serious threat to human freedom and world peace, no democratic labor movement could be too much anti-Nazi in its propaganda, activities and struggle against this type of totalitarianism. Today, when Soviet Communism is the gravest danger to human liberty and world peace, it would be just as wrong to think that any democratic labor movement could be too much anti-Communist in its propaganda, activities and struggle against totalitarian Communism.

Just as we could not be too much

anti-Nazi or too much anti-Fascist in 1939, so we cannot be too much anti-Communist totalitarian in 1952. To say that one could never be too much anti-Nazi and yet could be too much anti-Communist is to draw a false distinction between the two brands of totalitarian despotism and to give preference to the Communist form against the Nazi species of anti-human, tyrannical dictatorship. By drawing such false distinctions, one wittingly or unwittingly plays into the hands of Communism, which has replaced the defeated Nazism-Fascism as the main danger to democracy, world peace and social progress. The AFL warns against making such a fatal mistake. We stress that totalitarian Communism is no abstraction or idealistic social philosophy. We stress that totalitarian Communism is synonymous with slave labor, ruthless dictatorship, human degradation, total intellectual enslavement, destructive social conflict, military imperialist aggression, genocide and world war. To conduct a militant struggle against these reprehensible evils is not to engage in "mere negative" activities but to engage in the most positive constructive activities deserving of utmost support by free labor.

Hence, the AFL has avoided the plague of dogmas, the paralysis of self-deceiving, radical-sounding phrases and the prison of the clichés of so-called social significance in its

fight against Communism. Instead of dabbling in promises about profound social reorganization in the future, we of the AFL engage in positive, militant struggle for the continuous improvement of our working and living conditions, for the promotion of our democratic rights, the preservation and strengthening of our free trade unions as a completely independent labor organization, and for the maintenance of world peace.

It is in this positive sense that we have stepped up our activities in the fight against the negative and destructive role of Communism at home and abroad. It is in this light that we have placed the greatest emphasis on building and buttressing free trade unions in all lands as the most effective instruments of democracy and bulwarks against the extension of and domination by totalitarian tyranny.

AGENCY OF THE KREMLIN

At no other time in its history has Communism served so openly and brazenly as a servile and venal agency of the Kremlin's war machine. The Cominform, the Communist parties and their fellow-travelers and front organizations are nothing else but Moscow's worldwide fifth column, the Soviet's international machine of subversion and treason against the democratic countries. We need but cite the Communist role as peddlers of Moscow's hate campaign against America and the free world.

We have fought to expose the fraudulent peace propaganda of the Communists as designed solely to confuse and divide the non-Soviet peoples with a view to disarming them and, thereby, softening and weakening them for an eventual military assault by the Russian overlords of Stalinist despotism.

A most dangerous expression of frustration, despair and self-deception in the democratic world is so-called "neutralism." The AFL has been unsparing in its condemnation of and opposition to neutralism as a conscious or unwitting ally of Soviet imperialism. Whether "neutralism" is embraced by those honestly mistaken, or advocated and pushed by the dishonest and concealed enemies of world democratic unity against Soviet aggression, it plays right into the hands of the Russian warlords.

The AFL has determinedly fought "neutralism" in the ranks of labor everywhere because it is based on a number of utterly false assumptions.

It is not true, as the neutralists say, that the world crisis is caused by a conflict of interests between America and Russia. If our country wanted to desert the rest of the free world and allow it to fall prey to the Kremlin dictatorship, we could easily obtain for a number of years so-called peace and prosperity for ourselves. But the American people will have none of this selfish and self-degrading isolationism. In our resistance to Russian

aggression, we are first and above all protecting the weaker nations and helping them to become strong enough to stand on their own feet and preserve their own sovereignty, democratic liberties and economic welfare.

It is not true, as the neutralists say, that America and Russia are equally responsible for the tense international situation. The United States has not sought an inch of territory from or imposed a cent of tribute on any nation—whether it was an ally or an enemy or a neutral in the last war. In painful contrast, Communist Russia has plundered the soil and sapped the sovereignty of nations that were its friends no less than those that were its enemies in World War II.

PLANS WORLD CONQUEST

Moreover, throughout and for years after the last war, our country made costly concessions and paid dearly to the Moscow regime in order to maintain friendship with it and hold it in line as a non-disturber of peace. These American efforts have proved unavailing. The Kremlin has not responded. Every concession and effort for peace have been interpreted by Stalin as signs of our weakness and as occasions and opportunities for furthering Communist subversion, Russian expansionism and plans for world conquest.

Lest we forget, it was the Marshall Plan to aid broken-down Europe, to reconstruct its war-shattered economy

and to stabilize its democratic order which was seized upon by Russia as the signal for intensifying the cold war and extending it on the vastest scale with incredible ferocity. Even the most politically purblind can see that it is Russian "principles," policies and practices that are at the bottom of the current international tension.

It is likewise false, as the neutralists propagandize, that the United States will become the aggressor and attack Russia as soon as American military defense preparations are completed. First of all, we want nothing from Russia. All America asks is that Moscow call off her Communist dogs of war, stop bullying and assaulting the weaker peoples, and drop its imperialist intrigue and aggression in Asia as well as Europe. Had we wanted to impose by force our will on Russia, we would not have waited till now. We could have attacked the U.S.S.R. years before we disarmed, when we had decisive military superiority, or when we had overwhelming atomic supremacy, before Russia stole the atomic knowledge and know-how from us. But then as today, our country made peace its first desire, duty and goal. This has been America's consistent policy in the United Nations. It is Russia and not the United States that has used more than fifty vetoes in the United Nations against efforts in behalf of peace.

Only those who look upon Commu-

nism as a progressive doctrine and movement can fail to see the significance for world peace in the extreme patience shown by America throughout the protracted fruitless truce negotiations in Korea. Only those who look upon Russia as the historical wave of the future can fail to see in America's heavy sacrifices in Korea (to halt and defeat Communist aggression against the ideals and aspirations of the UN) inspiring and overwhelming proof of America's devotion to a policy of reducing to a minimum the dangers of a world war and making unparalleled efforts to preserve world peace.

ANTI-AMERICAN SLANDERS

The neutralist aides-de-camp of world Communism have conjured up a war-mongering America threatening world peace merely because it calls for and helps resistance to the *one* and only power that is today aggressive and subverts and resists all efforts at international harmony. These same neutralists, in their propaganda to undermine international democratic trust in America and to weaken the reliance of the democracies on our country as the leading protector against Soviet aggression, have simultaneously resorted to anti-American slanders from the very opposite angle. While charging America with seeking to swallow the rest of the world, they have been simultaneously seeking to spread panic among the free peoples

by saying that the United States is returning to isolationism. This non-sensical propaganda amalgam by these neutralists has been completely exploded by the repudiation at the recent Republican Convention of those who would have America make even the slightest gesture in the direction of neo-isolationism.

The fight of the AFL against world Communism is an organic and vital phase of its energetic efforts to help the free countries of the world become strong enough to deter and defeat Communist aggression from without and to withstand and eliminate totalitarian subversion from within. Here

we have but one aim, a single and overriding purpose—to discourage aggression and to preserve peace. The workers and the freedom-loving peoples of all lands can count on the more than eight million members of the AFL to do everything in their power to counteract and reject all advocates of policies calling for military adventures. While stressing this course, the AFL will also continue its present policy of giving wholehearted support to all those who, in the countries of totalitarian oppression, strive for the re-establishment of free trade unions, democracy and the rights of free citizenship.



Sacrifice for the Mass

If someone with the knowledge to do it would write a book about the price that gallant men and women have paid, gladly, to hear Mass all through the ages, from the time of the catacombs until now, in all the countries of the world, what an inspiration that would be! And how it would shame us when we do not go to Mass simply because it would mean a little effort, which we are too lazy to make.

In our days, stories of the Mass, penetrating in their beauty and heroism, come to us from many parts of the world, where to celebrate Mass may easily cost a priest's life. Strange, lovely whispers come from Siberia, of Mass offered on a felled tree, a little stone from the ground for altar, and the celebrant, a venerable bishop, dancing in the snow for joy, at the *Ite Missa Est*. Again, of a little wine frozen in a wooden cup, which had to be melted over the priest's heart before it could be changed into the Precious Blood.—Caryll Houselander in *MARIST MISSIONS*, Framingham Centre, Mass., August-September, 1952.

Catholics and Prejudice

THE REV. DANIEL M. CANTWELL
President, Housing Conference of Chicago

*Reprinted from THE VOICE OF ST. JUDE**

IT WAS to be a new start in life for the Minter family. With a good job waiting for him in Yakima, Wash., Melvin Minter, a Louisiana lumber worker, put his wife and ten children and all their belongings on a pickup truck, and began the 2,000-mile trek to the Northwest.

Half-way there, on a mountain road in Colorado, the Minter truck had to swerve to avoid a car coming out of a side road. The truck skidded and overturned. One of the older children, Margaret, 14, died. Mrs. Minter was seriously injured, and the others were cut and bruised.

The tragedy happened in the little town of Fruita, Colorado. Fruita had always been an all-white town. And the Minters were Negroes. But, thank God, the townspeople did not let the accident of color blind their hearts to the need of a family which had suffered another kind of accident.

People from the town rushed the Minters to a hospital; gave them a house to live in; gave Mr. Minter a job; collected money to pay their hospital bills and fix their truck; and

paid for the dead daughter's funeral. The City Judge and Police Chief were pallbearers.

In the midst of all this good neighborliness, someone discovered that the town had a Jim Crow ordinance which everyone had forgotten. They wouldn't let a ridiculous law stand in the way of being human. They called it unconstitutional, tore it out of the ordinance book so that it should never get in anyone's way again.

Unfortunately little of this kind of spontaneous Christianity makes headlines. When a Negro family comes into the community for the first time, not every town acts as the people of Cicero, Illinois, acted a year ago last July.

At that time Harvey Clark and his wife with their two children thought they had found an apartment in a healthy, convenient community. What happened to them is, I suppose, known to all the readers of this magazine. Indeed, it is known to people in every part of the world. The picture of the huge bonfire in which was destroyed all of their hard-won pos-

* 221 W. Madison St., Chicago 6, Ill., July, 1952.

sessions, their little girl's piano, valuable keepsakes, like their marriage license and family photos, appeared in newspapers everywhere.

The Cicero incident was a gruesome reality. But that isn't all that there was to it. From all over the land came letters of sympathy to the Clarks. Some offered places to live. Many brought financial gifts to make up for what the Clarks had lost. Everywhere there sprang up human beings who insisted on being human and being their brother's keepers.

CATHOLIC REACTION

What concerns me in this article is how the consciences of Catholics should react to racial violence or to race prejudice when they meet it. A good practical example may be seen in the way a group of Catholics in Chicago's western suburbs reacted to Cicero, which was so close to them.

Shocked by the sinfulness of what they saw and heard and by the breakdown of law in their peaceful neighborhood, a group of thirty Catholic suburbanites, brought together by the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago, decided they could not be silent. They addressed a public letter to their neighbors—particularly their “fellow Catholics”—and released it to the metropolitan and local press.

Courageously they asked themselves and their neighbors these questions:

“Has our attitude toward the Clark

family moving into Cicero to find a decent place to live been pleasing or displeasing to God?

“If we have been opposed to the Clarks or any other Negro family obtaining homes among us, is it not a duty to Christ and the Church to change our attitude and to help others to change?

“Should we not feel an individual responsibility to make some restitution to the Clarks for the destruction of all their personal possessions?”

The letter attracted attention. To the Negro community it brought hope. The Catholic press picked it up and reprinted it widely. Through this means alone at least a million people read about it. It became the first step toward the setting up of a Catholic Interracial Council in Chicago's western suburbs and of a continuing educational program in the parishes to make Catholics aware that the Church has something definite to say about interracial relations.

As with other Catholics in almost every part of the country, these suburbanites considered that it was no longer possible to close their eyes to the challenge of race prejudice. They joined ranks with those organizations which have been working for interracial justice over the years: with, for example, the other Catholic Interracial Councils which exist in nineteen American cities; with the Catholic Committee of the South; with the National Federation of Catholic Col-

lege Students; with the three Friendship Houses; with the New Orleans Institute of Social Order. And with many others.

BROTHERS IN CHRIST

There is a common conviction that runs through all of this effort: a Catholic who draws lines racially makes a lie of his faith. It is not hard to show why.

Every time a Catholic receives Holy Communion, a tie is forged between himself and other men which is stronger than the ties of blood or social position.

Every time a Catholic offers Mass, he accepts his fellowmen as equals and brothers. Otherwise he has no part with Christ, Who is the real priest and the principal offerer at Mass.

Every time a Catholic at the altar offers Christ as his gift to the Father, he expresses his esteem and honor for his fellowmen. In Christ they are all offered to the Father. Only the gift of the Whole Christ—Head and Members—is acceptable to the Father.

Every time a Catholic thinks of heaven, he looks forward to sharing God's life and sharing it with his fellowmen. Then will Christ's prayer have its full answer: "Father, I pray that they all may be one as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee." But Heaven begins on earth. And so Christ said that love and unity among his followers would be the proof by

which "the world would know that Thou hast sent Me."

Every time a Catholic looks at a new-born baby, he knows that God is really the Father of every human person; that he has life because God has made his soul; that he shares God's dignity because his soul is made in God's image.

Every time a Catholic sees someone suffer, he is on fire, because he sees Christ suffer. It is Christ Who is beaten, Who is homeless, is naked, is lonely and outcast, is dishonored, oppressed, segregated. For Christ, then, no difficulty is too great to surmount. The walls must come tumbling down.

No one, therefore, should have difficulty in understanding the strong movement for interracial justice among Catholics in the United States. It follows from our faith. Moreover, our Holy Father has encouraged it. The conversion of significant numbers of Negroes demands it. World peace today depends upon it.

Unfortunately, few people realize how often and forcefully Pope Pius XII has spoken about race hatred.

On Holy Saturday this year our Holy Father told a group of Belgian pilgrims: "Only a common faith can bring about the deepest union of men. There must be no distinction of races or color or social and cultural standing."

In his first solemn world-wide letter after he became Pope, Pius XII pointed out that foremost among the

"pernicious errors, widespread today, is the forgetfulness of that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong."

Two years later he gave the world his immortal letter on the Mystical Body of Christ. He asked us to look upon the Church as the social Body of Christ.

In this letter he pointed out: "Men may be separated by nationality and race, but our Saviour poured out His Blood to reconcile all men to God through the Cross and bid them all unite in one Body."

Finally to a group of Americans who visited him in 1946 our Holy Father asked "the blessings of Almighty God" on "all who labor to further the cause of interracial justice." He added that "all men are brothers in Jesus Christ; for He, though God, became also man, became a member of the human family, a brother of all."

Despite the words of our Holy Father not a few American Catholics have considered race prejudice and discrimination in the United States a matter of minor importance. They have argued that the major task is the conversion of Negroes; that attacking discrimination and segregation may lead to violent social upheaval; that social peace demands the separa-

tion of racial groups; that there is nothing morally wrong with compulsory segregation; that only agitators and Communists are interested in eliminating race distinction.

ERRORS REFUTED

Today dozens of bishops and moral theologians could be cited in refutation of such errors. This writer recently edited a small volume of such statements called *Catholics Speak on Race Relations*. (Fides Publishers, Chicago, 1952). Of all the statements, possibly the most pointed was released in March, 1950 for worldwide circulation by *Fides News*—agency of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. It was prepared by Father John La Farge, S.J., for *Fides*, and appeared in pamphlet form under the title, *The Catholic Church and Negroes in the U.S.*, published by the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago.

The *Fides* statement declared why more than convert-making and social welfare services among Negroes must be undertaken by the Church:

Any thought of a wide, general conversion of the Negroes to the Catholic Church is an illusion until and unless the attitude of American Catholics is completely purified of approval of the segregation policy or of the many deprivations of educational opportunity, of fair employment, and of decent housing that arise as a result of it. . . .

Work for the Negroes is dashed against a hopeless obstacle unless the walls of prejudice and racial discrimination are

broken down by a specially directed program for interracial justice. . . .

According to the statement of *Fides* the notion that segregation is necessary to maintain peace demonstrates profound confusion:

Attempts are made to justify segregation by saying that it produces peace and harmony by keeping separate people who would otherwise be in conflict. This ignores the fact that separation itself is a principal cause of conflict . . . since it fosters those traits in both the majority and minority groups that lead to conflict. . . .

However, there is a more cogent reason for putting an end to discrimination and segregation—namely, the law of God. Many theologians have spoken about it. Racial discrimination and compulsory segregation offend God and are morally wrong. As the *Fides* statement succinctly put it: "The policy of compulsory segregation is a grave derogation to the Christian concept of the individual's inherent dignity. . . ."

But what of those who maintain that doing away with segregation is aping the Communist party line?

The *Fides* statement admitted that Communists spare no pains to offer their services to the Negro peasant and agricultural worker, the Negro laborer, the Negro housewife, youth and intellectual. This fact, however, should not deter us from living up to our faith. Rather it should stir us on:

The constant effort made by Communists to convince the Negroes that the Communists alone take an active and

sincere interest in their problems has placed before the Negroes in many instances the disagreeable alternative of seeking Communist aid, if none is forthcoming from Christian or Catholic sources. . . .

That Communism has so far had an unsympathetic reception from American Negroes is a tribute to the patriotism and good sense of American Negroes. This, however, is no reason for a weak and compromising attitude on the part of Catholics. Such an attitude "not only plays into the hands of Communists in America; it is food for Communist propaganda throughout the world."

Negroes, as the *Fides* statement warned, will not be fooled by double-talk:

As Negroes have become more educated they have grown more aware of the extreme discrepancy which exists between an attitude of [prejudice] and the real spirit of the Catholic Church. They read of the great pronouncements of the Holy Father, the head of Christendom, and contrast his words of friendship and affection with the unfriendly attitude of the people next door. . . .

What the future policy and practice of American Catholics should be, as seen from the special vantage point of the Holy See, should now be clear enough. A little additional reflection on the world-wide struggle for human freedom and the threat of Communism to our very survival should make this duty even more compelling.

As the world divides into opposing camps, America needs friends as

never before. If we are to get them, Americans will have to realize that two-thirds of the world's people are colored. To date these people, who number more than 1.5 billion have not been much impressed about what we say concerning freedom and democracy. They interpret us to mean freedom for white people. They have seen the way we act towards colored people in the United States.

An event like last July's riot in Cicero is no longer just a local skirmish. We live in a glass house. Racial clashes here make headlines in the far corners of the world. This writer has seen headlines recording the Cicero clash in newspapers in Buenos Aires, Argentina; Antwerp, Belgium; Caracas, Venezuela; Rome, Italy; Copenhagen, Denmark; Bogota, Colombia; Hong Kong, China; Madrid, Spain; Havana, Cuba; Berne, Switzerland. Some friends who were in France and Israel in July, 1951, said that they saw Cicero headlines in those countries, too.

INTERNATIONAL REACTION

The international reaction to the Cicero incident was a cause of real worry to the U. S. State Department. So concerned were Department officials that they sent a prominent Negro American abroad on a good-will mission. He tried to assure other countries that Cicero incidents are not daily occurrences in the U. S.

The Communist propaganda ma-

chine found abundant fuel in the Cicero skirmish, as it does in all racial clashes in the U. S. Nothing can stop that propaganda machine from grinding on daily. Frequently enough *Pravda* and the Voice of Russia dish out lies, which are comparatively easy to answer. But in the racial matters the Communists don't have to lie.

The clash in Cicero actually happened. So did the clash in Cairo, Illinois. And a U. S. soldier—because he was an American Indian—was actually refused burial in the cemetery in Sioux City. Men are discriminated against in employment. Schools do refuse to admit Negroes. Hospitals are shut to them, sometimes Catholic ones, too. What kind of answer can we give for these things?

In one sense, there is no answer. Even the fact that we refuse to try to justify these incidents and bad practices is already the beginning of an answer. However, wringing our hands and shaking our heads is not enough. Our love for God urges us to do something effective.

We will have to make clear that we will fight for the dignity and freedom of every man; that we will protect the right of people to live where they will and to enjoy adequate living space; that we do not believe that bathtubs, automobiles and TV sets create a Utopia; that whether all Americans enjoy human rights and freedom is more important to us; that in the attainment of human rights both our

democracy and Christianity face a test in action.

We have a long way to go, but we are moving forward. Even the Cicero incident cannot becloud the manifest gains in human relations in recent months in Chicago.

These are the things we in Chicago are proud of:

A Negro woman student from Chicago was elected homecoming queen at the University of Illinois . . . More retail stores hired people from minority groups . . . The Chicago White Sox baseball team played Minnie Minoso regularly . . . The Illinois Chamber of Commerce initiated a statewide educational program for voluntary fair employment practices among industrial and commercial establishments . . . Eighteen Negroes now hold position on staffs of four medical colleges.

A resolution supporting non-discrimination was overwhelmingly adopted by 36 commercial and business schools in the Chicago area . . . Public parks and beaches were in-

creasingly used by minority groups . . . Hiring of workers from minority groups in non-traditional jobs increased. Police officers began taking human relations courses at city colleges . . . 20,000 Negro families have moved to homes outside the established Negro area since the end of World War II with minor and often no opposition . . . Whereas in 1950 there were ten occasions of crowds gathering to demonstrate hostility against members of other racial groups, in 1951 there was only one.

Even in Cicero members of the police force will attend a human relations school this summer . . . An official Cicero Commission on Human Relations has been promised.

Of these things we boast. To boast of them might do more for winning friends around the world—and in Heaven—than the movies and the success stories of Hollywood. To boast of them might really be humility, might show our respect and love for God and our fellowmen.



Anti-Communism

Some of the best Catholic authorities have given warning that there can be too much denunciation of Communism. Familiarity breeds contempt. There can also be confusion of Catholic and worldly reasons for opposing Communism. There are materialistic capitalists as well as materialistic Socialists and the former cannot be depended upon as defenders of religious interests against Communism. Moreover, some who make loud profession of anti-Communism are opposed to legitimate and necessary measures of reform in accord with social justice. The Church is injured in the minds of the people by association with sinister interests.

—Henry Somerville in *THE CANADIAN REGISTER, Kingston, Ont., Sept. 13, 1952.*

Who's a Socialist?

REV. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

Assistant Director, Social Action Dept., NCWC

An NCWC release, September 17, 1951.

WHEN one politician calls another politician a Socialist during a political campaign or on the eve thereof, sophisticated citizens take it with a grain of salt. Politicians, however, are not the only ones who are being labeled as Socialists or "collectivists" on the eve of the 1952 elections. The circle has been widened to include the clergy.

Several magazines recently have published feature articles alleging that large numbers of American clergymen are wittingly or unwittingly promoting the cause of Socialism. Usually the charge is limited to the Protestant clergy, but one writer—a Protestant minister himself—has suggested that the Catholic clergy and the Catholic press have also been contaminated. The writer in question is the Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth, N. J. and Chairman of the General Commission on (Army and Navy) Chaplains.

In a feature article in the August 13 issue of the influential *Freeman*, devoted principally to an analysis of real or alleged Socialist tendencies

within the Protestant clergy, Dr. Robinson parenthetically includes the Catholic clergy in his general indictment. "Discussion of socialism in the teaching and the preaching of the Roman Catholic faith," he says in a footnote, "should, appropriately, be undertaken by a Roman Catholic priest. However, interested laymen of all faiths may wish to consult *America* or the *Catholic Mind* for evidence that large segments of the Catholic clergy favor social planning and collectivist economic measures."

Having already "consulted" every issue of *America* for the past 15 years and every issue of the *Catholic Mind* for the past 10 years, we can only conclude that Dr. Robinson's definition of Socialism is fundamentally different from our own and from that of the Jesuit editors of these two distinguished Catholic periodicals. The editorial policy of *America* and the *Catholic Mind* is based on traditional Catholic social teaching as summarized in the social encyclicals of the Popes and the pastoral letters of the American bishops. In other words, it is as far removed from Socialism

as it is from *laissez-faire* individualism—as any self-respecting Socialist would be the first to testify.

This means that *America* and the *Catholic Mind*, while favoring an anti-Socialist program of widespread ownership of productive property and emphasizing the importance of economic self-government along the lines of the anti-Socialist industry-council plan, editorially support a certain amount of governmental intervention, particularly during the present national emergency. It also means that these two periodicals, while rejecting Socialism and “collective economic measures” (cf. almost any issue of either magazine), also reject the philosophy of economic individualism.

Therein lies the difficulty, as you might have been led to expect. Dr. Robinson, if we have understood him correctly, is committed wholeheartedly to the philosophy of economic individualism and has so defined Socialism as to include any and all measures which would interfere in any way with the operations of the “free market.” Any criticism of capitalism makes him very suspicious; and any attempt to establish a middle-of-the-road position as between Communism and capitalism, he judges to be synonymous with Socialism.

We can readily agree with Dr. Robinson that Karl Marx is wrong, but we can hardly be expected to

share his enthusiasm for the writings of Ludwig von Mises, who is almost as critical of Catholic social teaching as he is of Marxist Socialism. By the same token we can share Dr. Robinson's criticism of bureaucratic “planning,” but we can hardly be expected to applaud—even if we understand—his very unusual criticism of Catholic “social action.” Much of the religious press, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, he says, “demands ‘social action’ for the ‘solution’ of economic problems.” This is Dr. Robinson's way of suggesting that the Catholic press is contributing to the growth of Socialism in America.

A DISSERVICE

We have no reason to question Dr. Robinson's sincerity, but we cannot refrain from suggesting that both he and the editors of the *Freeman* are doing a great disservice—not so much to the Church as to their own favorite cause of anti-Socialism—by devaluing the currency of the American language. Their extremely careless use of words like “Socialism” and “collectivism” is calculated to cause confusion rather than clarity in the public mind and, worst of all from their point of view, is calculated to play right into the hands of the small minority of real Socialists still extant in the United States.

If Dr. Robinson and the *Freeman* insist, however, on adopting their own peculiar definition of Socialism,

we can only hope that their next indictment of the Catholic press and the Catholic clergy will be expanded to include not only *America* and the *Catholic Mind* but every other American Catholic periodical and every one of our approximately 40,000 Catholic priests. If Socialism is so defined by Dr. Robinson as to include the teaching of the social encyclicals, there is nothing for Catholics to do but stand up proudly and be counted. According to that definition of Socialism, all well-instructed Catholics are "Socialists" and in all fairness ought to be classified as

such—along with the editors of *America* and the *Catholic Mind*—by Dr. Robinson and the *Freeman*. It wouldn't be fair to leave the impression with readers of the *Freeman* that any well-instructed American Catholic is in agreement with the writings of von Mises, who, incidentally, says in the latest edition of his well-known treatise on "Socialism" that the Church is "an enemy of society" and "is not the least of the factors responsible for the prevalence of destructive ideals in the world today. . . ."

Take him away, Dr. Robinson. He's all yours.



Losses to the Faith

It is tragic that, at a time when the Church, despite the hindrances of atheistic enemies, is making great strides in many parts of the world and reaching out in this country a welcoming hand to those once regarded as unapproachable, there should be losses of those born into the Faith. This much is certain, if every Catholic of every station lived as he should, there would not be such losses. Indeed, there should be none. Calling those who leave "weak" Catholics is no excuse; it is the duty of Catholics to help those who are weak spiritually as well as physically. Charity is not alms-giving alone—perhaps alms-giving is the poorest, and easiest form of charity. Charity is love, and there can be no better proof of love than concern for the soul of the one loved.—THE PROVIDENCE VISITOR, *Providence, R. I., Aug. 12, 1952.*

Lay Missionaries

ROBERT L. REYNOLDS

*Reprinted from TODAY**

AS LAYMEN and women our obligation to the missions has always seemed pretty clear: we donate money or subscribe to a mission magazine, and that's that. For a small but growing number of lay people, however, giving money and praying for the work of the missionaries are not enough—necessary as these practices are. They feel the need to do more—to devote their whole lives to spreading the Mystical Body in foreign countries.

Recently, we went out to meet and talk to two such lay people who are members of the Society of Lay Auxiliaries of the Missions: Theresa Anawalt, an American, and Jaqueline Dejaiffe, a Belgian girl who heads the four-woman Chicago team. In their bright and spacious house in the University of Chicago area, we drank what is certainly the strongest coffee ever brewed and spent a fascinating hour and a half learning about their Society and its work.

It was founded, we learned, in Brussels, Belgium, in 1937, by Father A. Boland, and under the inspiration of Father Vincent Lebbe, longtime missionary to the Chinese. Father

Lebbe noted the need for laywomen to dedicate their lives to the missions.

Why the need for laywomen, we wanted to know. Isn't mission work the exclusive job of priests, brothers and nuns? The Lay Auxiliary, the priests with whom they have worked, and the foreign bishops who plead for more lay missionary vocations think not. As lay people, they can go among native families with greater ease. Just as there is need for a lay apostolate in the United States and elsewhere, the Church needs lay missionaries to mingle on the closest terms with the people of mission countries, to go into their homes, to train lay leaders among them.

"We do catechetical work when it's needed and when we're asked," Miss Anawalt pointed out. "But this isn't our primary function. Our missionary work has a long-range view—to lay the ground-work for the development of the Church in mission countries. We aren't just trying to convert people, but to help create an atmosphere in which the Church can develop. What's the use of converting people if their civilization remains anti-Christian?"

*638 Deming Pl., Chicago, Ill., October, 1951.

Beginning with only two young women, the Society slowly grew. By 1940, there were already a few members trained and ready to leave for mission lands. But war came to Belgium—and the rest of the world—and they could not leave. The work of recruiting and training new members went on, however, and by 1944 there were twenty-five young women enrolled.

TRAINING CENTER

At the Society's training center in Brussels, new members spend a year getting a groundwork in theology, philosophy and ethics under recognized priests and professors. A second phase of their training is professional, in one of the three fields: medical (to prepare the student for nursing and dispensary work in the missions), social (if she intends to do social work), or educational (if teaching is her aim). Finally, the trainee spends considerable time learning the language, culture and specific problems of the country to which she will be assigned.

Members of the Society take no "vows" in the sense that religious do. They do make certain promises: of stability—they must have the intention of devoting their entire lives to the missions; and of obedience—to the bishop under whom they will serve as lay missionaries. After six months in the Society, they make a promise to remain for one year, with

the intention of renewing the promise. Thereafter, they make a more solemn promise of five years. After two five-year periods, they may make a lifetime promise, or simply renew every five years, according to their own preference.

In 1946, the war over, the Lay Auxiliaries dispatched their first two teams to missions in Africa. The following year, two more arrived in China, starting work in Nanking and Peiping, respectively. "We go to a mission country," Miss Dejaiffe told us, "with the distinct idea of having ourselves replaced by native people as soon as possible. We want to train the native women so that they can do the job of spreading the Church in their own countries, so that all the riches of their own culture won't be stifled by a foreign culture. When we go to a foreign country, we try to live just as the natives do—we dress the same as they, do the same things, suffer the same hardships. So we begin to understand the reason why they do things as they do, and not in the same way we'd do them back home."

Miss Dejaiffe herself was a member of one of the two teams sent to China, at the request of Bishop Yu Pin of Nanking. When they arrived, the Bishop gave them a house to live in and three jobs to do: to make contact with the university students (who have great influence in China), to care for the poor (refugees were

streaming southward after the Communist successes in the north), and to interest the students in working with the poor.

"Fortunately, we were able to make friends with the people quickly," Miss Dejaiffe told us. "What struck them, I think, was our disinterestedness. They have been exploited by the white race so often, but once they found out we really wanted to become one of them and that we didn't despise their civilization, they were very generous in helping us."

FIRST MARTYR

One of the team members in Nanking was Mariette Dierkens. She was to become the Society's first martyr. One night in 1949, shortly before the Communists entered the city, a caller came to the Lay Auxiliaries' house in the middle of the night and asked Mariette to come to the aid of someone in distress. None of the Lay Auxiliaries considered this unusual; it had happened before. "Just after she left the house," Miss Dejaiffe said, "we heard a shot. By the time we reached her, she was dead. We never found out who did it. The city was in confusion—the Nationalist government had left and the Communists had not yet taken over officially." At Mariette's funeral, all classes of people filed through the house to "say goodbye" to her. "Rich and poor, students and non-students—everybody loved her," Miss Dejaiffe re-

marked sadly. A few days later the Communists entered Nanking, and the team had to leave.

Miss Dejaiffe, who had wanted to go to China from the first day she joined the Lay Auxiliaries in 1942, says they will go back some day. "It may be two years or two hundred," she told us, "but I'm sure that in one way or another we'll go back. Otherwise, we wouldn't have had our first martyr there as a sign that we could do something in China."

The two teams in Africa have not had the same difficulties. One of them settled in a town called Kolwezi, to which 40,000 natives had migrated to work in the mines. Coming directly from life in the bush, the people had no conception of living in a house with a stove and modern conveniences. There, the primary job was to train the native women in the domestic arts and to teach them to read and write.

"Previously," Miss Anawalt told us, "only the men and children were educated. Now the men are anxious to choose a wife from among the women trained at the school. They want to marry a woman who can be a real companion. Before, the fact that the women weren't educated meant that they grew apart from their families." The lay missionaries have received real help from the native women they have trained, indicating the soundness of the Society's

scheme of having natives replace its own members.

In addition to the two teams in Africa, another group of Lay Auxiliaries is preparing to open in ancient Damascus a House of Training for Arabian girls interested in becoming lay missionaries among their own people. Additional teams are preparing to go to Viet-Nam and Indo-China.

Miss Anawalt and Miss Dejaiffe, together with Maria Leblanc and Louise Gerardy, came to Chicago with the idea of setting up a center where perpetual open house would be held for students from the Orient, the Near East and Africa. (The Society operates similar houses in Paris and Brussels.) "We wanted it to be a place where they could come and prepare a Chinese meal for their friends, where they could hold discussions, offer hospitality to students from their own country who happened to be passing through the

city and had no other place to stay," Miss Anawalt said, adding, "and a place where priests of their own race could come and speak to the students in their own language, hear confessions, give lectures and spiritual direction."

The house, whose purchase was made possible in part by a generous loan, and whose furnishings were donated by Chicagoans interested in the Society's work, is attractive, roomy and comfortable. It looks like a fine place for students to recapture something of a family spirit, even though they are thousands of miles away from home.

Now numbering nearly ninety members—fifty trained and working, the other forty undergoing their preparatory studies in Brussels—the Society of Lay Auxiliaries of the Missions seems to be well established. After listening to people like Miss Dejaiffe and Miss Anawalt, it isn't hard to see why.



Family Obligations

Is a family Cadillac compatible with the spirit of poverty?

Is a television set a necessity or a luxury?

Is it more virtuous to plan far ahead for family obligations than to spend for today and not think about the future?

What is the virtuous mean between miserliness and extravagance in managing family funds?

Got the answers? If you haven't, don't worry; the questions are not the kind to be answered briefly or simply. But they are the kind of questions that ought to start some fruitful discussion among Catholic parents.—NORMAN C. McKENNA in *THE MISSIONARY SERVANT*, Silver Spring, Md., September, 1952.

Editorials

Taft and Catholic Schools

THE fact that the Republican convention put an end to Senator Robert Taft's Presidential aspiration (he has announced that he will not again be a candidate) makes it possible to discuss, without entering the realm of partisan politics, the question of his views on Catholic schools.

He sponsored, in 1947, one of those perennial Federal aid to education bills which Catholics construe as unfair to pupils of Catholic schools (it failed of passage). He was on record as having written, in 1945, that he considered Catholic schools an unnecessary duplication of public schools (he later explained that he meant only that it was unnecessary for the State to pay for Catholic school education when it was already providing public schools for all).

In a later clarification of his position, in 1950, he expressed opposition to the notorious Barden bill because it refused Federal aid to non-public school pupils in States which were willing to give such service, but said he would not want the Federal aid project used to give this bus service in States which were opposed to it. (The U. S. Supreme Court had ruled that it was constitutional to use pub-

lic funds to provide bus transportation for pupils of non-public schools, so that Senator Taft's stand would make the Federal Government a party to an obvious injustice.)

A warm defense of Senator Taft's stand on schools and other matters of Catholic interest appears in the July issue of *The Catholic World*. Written by Richard L. Stokes, a relentless critic of the present Administration, the article quite openly suggests that Catholics should have no hesitation in voting for Mr. Taft for President, and in that respect it is now, of course, entirely pointless. But it does reveal that Mr. Stokes thinks Catholics should be satisfied to find a public figure who does not flagrantly oppose justice for the children attending Catholic schools. It would be possible to mention several, in both political parties, who have taken a firmer stand for fairness than Senator Taft has.—PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, July 17, 1952.

"The Lion of Bavaria"

HIS Eminence, Michael Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich and Freising, who died June 12, on the Feast of Corpus Christi, was one of the most coura-

geous and valiant figures of World War II. His courage was equaled only by his Christian kindness.

The Nazis suppressed the press, controlled the radio, dominated the educators, muzzled the labor unions and silenced every other channel of communication except the Church. That they were powerless to do. And Cardinal Faulhaber, "the Lion of Bavaria," was the personification of the Church's defiance of the powers of evil.

The Cardinal immediately realized the dangers of Nazism. His consciousness of its viciousness was deepened by his personal observation of Hitler and his cohorts. Despite threats and frightful pressure, the Cardinal continued to denounce Nazi efforts to deprive the Church of its God-given rights. So vigorously did he flay anti-Semitism that Nazi leaders incited a mob attack on his residence in an attempt to do him bodily harm.

When the Nazis surrendered, Bavaria became part of the American zone. An appeal from the Cardinal to the farmers to furnish food for the cities prevented riot and bloodshed, and was of incalculable assistance to the occupying authorities. His Eminence continued to resist attacks on religion, whether from the left or the right—and some American Leftists tried to effect in Germany what they have failed to effect here. But the Car-

dinal's relations with responsible U.S. occupation officials were not merely friendly but cordial. He was deeply grateful to American Catholics for a charity which reflected that of his own great heart. His final years were saddened by the domination of Communism in the immediate vicinity of his own great Archdiocese. But he left his people a heritage of courage which, through the Providence of God, will strengthen them to meet any resurgence of the totalitarian enemy. —CATHOLIC NEWS, New York, N. Y., June 21, 1952.

Hot-Weather Saints

HOT weather brings with it for most humans a certain amount of physical discomfort and suffering. For most of us, the suffering is not as intense as one would gather from the conversation. However, it is suffering—in a minor way.

Now one of the lessons that all Christians must learn is that suffering is part of living. Pains and aches and wounds and scars and anxieties and worries and fears and other forms of mental anguish are the lot of all members of the human family.

Only when we see suffering as God sees it, does it make sense. Only when we accept suffering as God's plan for us does it help us earn our eternal salvation.

In His divine plan, God ordained that the selfish, willful sin of our first

parents, and all succeeding sins, should be compensated for by His Son, Christ Jesus. We call Him our Redeemer because He purchased our souls by His long drawn out suffering and painful death upon the Cross. That's the way God wanted it.

In this important matter of suffering Christ gave us an example. He showed us that love will gladly accept the greatest pain and abandonment for the sake of the loved one. With joy, Christ endured His passion because He was doing it for us—for each single one of us individually.

Most of us in this country are not called upon to undergo terrific suffering. In other lands our fellow Catholics are being tortured and put to death for Christ. Here all we are offered are small opportunities to accept suffering as Christ wants us to. An annoying headache, a lengthy illness that confines a person to bed, a painful burn, a sleepless night because of the heat—this is the type of suffering that is offered.

Isn't it foolish to squander these opportunities to become more like Christ? If we accept whatever of discomfort comes our way from the hand of our loving Father in heaven—as Christ did, gladly, willingly and all the while imploring grace to carry on—we are by degrees making saints of ourselves. It's not only the sensible thing to do, but a most profitable one. Use the hot weather and all other

physical discomforts to make yourself into a more perfect Christian. Offer your sufferings, in union with Christ, to God. You'll have all eternity to rejoice in the fact that you made good use of all sufferings that came your way.—CATHOLIC HERALD CITIZEN, Milwaukee, Wis., July 19, 1952.

Uncensored

WHEN we read a breathlessly worded advertisement last week that announced that a Cincinnati theater was showing an uncensored film, we expected something that would make the movie patrons attend the theater in disguise. But the last line of the ad informed us, in small type, that the film was a newsreel of the GOP convention. Either something went on at the convention that a dozen TV cameras and more than a thousand reporters failed to discover, or the theater ad, like theater ads everywhere, was trying to make the film sound far more daring than it actually was.

We thought the Republican convention delegates behaved themselves as well as political convention delegates have always done. Beyond going a little mad when their candidates' names were mentioned and saying the nasty things about each other that politicians always say, they were a sober lot. There was nothing worth censoring in the convention except maybe a few hundred thousand words

from the speeches, and this was only because they were dull, not dirty.

But that did not bother the theater ad man. The newsreel was uncensored, and he milked that stirring word for all it was worth.

If the newsreel itself was not significant, the fact that the exhibitor defied the Ohio Board of Film Censorship certainly was. It was part of a concerted campaign by the State's film exhibitors to test the constitutionality of Ohio's film censorship law. Encouraged by the U. S. Supreme Court's decision in the *Miracle* case, the exhibitors feel that now is the time to rid themselves of what they regard as an intolerable restraint.

In the *Miracle* case, it will be recalled, the Supreme Court ruled specifically that it was unconstitutional to ban a motion picture on the grounds that it was sacrilegious. It declared also that motion pictures are entitled to the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and of the press. It thereby overthrew a decision made in a 1915 Ohio film censorship case that defined movies as being primarily a form of entertainment and not as something comparable to the public press. In its recent decision the court also noted, however, that "it does not follow that the Constitution requires absolute freedom to exhibit every motion picture of every kind at all times and all places." It left the door open, there-

fore, for some kind of state censorship.

We have some sympathy with the exhibitors' opposition to newsreel censorship. But it is no secret that they want the whole censorship law abolished. Even here we could agree with the exhibitors if we felt they could be trusted to show films that would not offend against public morality. But their record leaves us with no such confidence in their sense of responsibility. We do not say this about all exhibitors, but there are enough irresponsible members of their group to make a state censorship law advisable.

We have no love for film censorship in itself. It restricts human liberty and should be regarded only as the lesser of two evils—the other evil being the danger to public morality that would follow the lifting of censorship. Ohio censorship is rather lax as it is—right now Cincinnati theaters are showing several pictures labeled objectionable by the Legion of Decency—but there is reason to believe that without censorship the movie houses and the distributors would be even more irresponsible than they are now in their choice of films, and when an ad man would write "uncensored" in describing a film, it would be just as morally objectionable as the word is meant to imply.—CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH REGISTER, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 25, 1952.

Documentation

St. Vincent de Paul Society

POPE PIUS XII

*An address of His Holiness to delegates of the Italian National Congress
of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, April 27, 1952.*

YOUR presence, beloved sons and daughters of the Conference of Saint Vincent de Paul, gathered together in congress in this dear city, gives great comfort to Our heart, which is beset by so many anxieties. In union with the serried ranks which labor in the multiiform field of Christian charity everywhere, you represent a steady shining light in the darkness that envelops the world of today, which can attribute its baneful disorder to the almost extinct sense of charity and fraternity.

The phalanxes of charity are living forces in the midst of the human family and of the Church: living, because fruitful and irresistible, like the love that inspires them and the Church that enshrines them, which, in the deepest and widest sense of the word, may be called the Church of charity.

And, indeed, what serene observer of her past or present could fail to note this distinctive characteristic of the Church, which is herself the fruit of that Love which is the beginning of the creation and of the redemption, just as it is the end of every created spirit in the eternal and blessed communication of itself?

The readiness of Christian charity in supplying men and works at all times for the relief of human misery is a fact which has ever been a motive for wonder to the student of the history of the Church and, to the believer, a confirmation of her divine origin. And the wonder grows when regard is had to the fact that those who gave direction to the immanent spirit of charity were, for the most part, simple, humble souls who, in turn, always found at hand numerous and faithful followers. So also today there is no Catholic district without a glorious name which of itself is the expression of an epic of Christian charity.

But who can follow the path of Christian charity, which was opened by the Apostles themselves, in the beginnings of the Church, with the collections instituted by them at the fraternal "agapai" or banquets, where patrician and slave sat side by side, with the institution of deacons who were assigned to the loving assistance of children and widows? The first rapid spread of the Christian idea is, without any doubt, to be attributed chiefly to this lyricism of charity, which was unknown in the world before that time and which made the pagans exclaim: "Behold how they love one another!" The entire history of the Church is shot through with it as with

a golden thread, which binds it to that loving Heart whence it gushed forth.

Charity is ever spontaneous, just as the springtime bursts forth spontaneous at the touch of the renewed heat of the sun—Christ is the sun of His Church—just as that which is inborn in spontaneous—and is not Christ its life-blood? Charity is always at call, as if a special impulse of the Holy Spirit sharpens the vision of the Christian to discover every form of misery wherever it may be hidden, and unsettles the heart until there is a work corresponding to every type of misfortune and a group of brethren engaged in dealing with it.

Thus was born and thus expanded the beneficent current of charity, giving life to those institutions which are now the boast of every civilization and which come under the names of, for example, hospitals, orphanages, orders for the redemption of slaves, companies for pilgrims, houses for women exposed to moral dangers, associations for visiting and aiding prisoners and, in more recent times, leper colonies, institutes for the assistance of poor and old people, of the blind, of deafmutes, of emigrants, of children of prisoners, of mutilated children, all of which, together with the names of their founders and associates, are among the most precious gems that adorn the mystical Body of Christ.

In the setting of this far-seeing adaptability to the times We see the rise, the establishment and the flourishing of the Conferences of Saint Vincent de Paul, whose name reflects credit on the whole Church. What were the first thoughts that urged the eight Parisian students to found them? You have learned them from him who has well been called their soul: the great lay apostle of the 19th century. Frederic Ozanam. In the year of his death, almost 100 years ago now, he stated at Florence:

When we Catholics tried to recall to our wayward brothers the glories of Christianity, they said to us: Christianity in other times accomplished wonders; but today it is dead. And you, for example, who boast of being Catholics, what are you doing? Where are the works which give proof of your faith and should lead us to respect and accept it?" (Baudrillart, Frederic Ozanam, Paris 1912, pp. 12-13.)

The same question, but in fact attributable to a scanty knowledge of the life of the Church, is sometimes also raised by modern pagans, as We saw some years ago in a missionary review. A Japanese professor said to a missionary: "I have come to the conclusion that the Catholic religion is the one true religion. Nevertheless, I must say that you Catholics do not believe in what you say and preach . . . because you do not put it into practice."

The flowering of Christian charity and, in particular, the founding of the Conferences is an eloquent answer to the baseless scandal of the Parisian students, as also to the equally shortsighted scandal of modern critics. "It was then that we said to ourselves," continues Ozanam, "To work! Let us help our neighbor, and let us put our faith under the protection of charity." Thus were born your Conferences which, notwithstanding the passage of the years, preserve, as is characteristic of works willed by God, all their original freshness, as if the unchanging youth of their founders had been transmitted to them.

Hence, to you, who have come to Our presence to ask a word of illumination and encouragement in the practice of your vocation, We simply say: Continue, without fearing that your work is in vain. Since you have been called by God to this particular work in His vineyard, there is nothing better that you can do to fulfill the divine will in yourselves, to contribute to the triumph of the Church, to cooperate in the salvation of souls.

We wish, then, to give you three brief thoughts for your meditation, which will remain as a salutary *memento* of this audience and as a spur to your activity, just as his visit to this Vatican hill was a motive for renewed zeal to Ozanam.

1. CHARITY IS A SURE FORM OF ASCETICISM

One of the merits of Christianity, and an indication of its exuberant vitality, is the fact that the goal which God has fixed for every soul, namely sanctity, can be reached by divers ways. The spirit breathes how and where it wills: hence the manifold variety of saints who shine like stars in the firmament of the Church and preach the richness of divine gifts. But there is no doubt that charity, if practised constantly, and with heroism when necessary, is second to none as a way leading directly to holiness. Charity toward one's neighbor, motivated by the theological virtues and harmonized with the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude, can constitute a safe foundation for high perfection.

In this way the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, with their frequent visits to the poor, their assistance to abandoned children, their furnishing of financial help—their members becoming in a sense beggars for the poor—can suffice as schools of sanctity and training centers for religious perfection, just as the cloister, the desert, the school, the direct apostolate, the missions to pagan lands have been and are for other souls. An abiding sense of compassion for the poor provides inspiration and fervor for mental and vocal prayer, a stimulus for mortification and self-denial, and a strengthening for chastity and humility. All the other virtues can be founded upon this dominating motive, which is one of the greatest precepts promulgated by Our Redeemer with the explicit words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

2. THE APOSTOLATE OF CHARITY IS IRRESISTIBLE

You know well that your Conferences began with an apostolic purpose. Soon they were to shine forth among the most efficacious forms of apostolate operating in the Church today. Nor could it be otherwise, because the apostolate is in itself a fruit of charity: of the love of God, Whom we wish to see glorified in every soul; of the love of our neighbor, whom we wish to make partaker of the supreme good. The apostolate is an expression of charity and therein it is accomplished and strengthened.

If you examine as Christians the motives that draw you to the Conferences of St. Vincent, you will probably find that while you are urged on by the human sense of pity for the material needs of your brethren, you are especially tormented by the longing to help them in their spiritual needs, which are often caused by their material want. Thus you are attracted to

them by your desire to make them rich in spirit, serene in their sufferings, sharers in the inexhaustible good things of God. It would, in truth, be a lesser good to relieve the hunger of men's bodies without turning their minds to Christ and His will, leaving their souls still hungry for the substantial bread of truth and of the eternal promises. Anybody who relieves material miseries for the sole purpose of satisfying his innate sentiment of compassion is performing a purely human work. The Christian goes, and must go, further; he must feel that higher pity which is satisfied only by giving God to souls.

Go to the poor, therefore, as good sowers, as zealous shepherds, as loving fathers and brothers, as upholders of the faith, often unknown but always dear to God. If you love the poor with the same love as Christ, He will place on your lips the words which will enlighten, convince and convert, and nobody will be able to resist the force of love.

3. THE ACTION OF CHARITY IS FRUITFUL

We have recently exhorted the faithful to action for the salvation of the world, for the triumph of justice and peace, and for overcoming the acute crisis of the present time. That same action you can accomplish successfully by exercising the virtue of charity in your Conferences, because true love is always fruitful and its practice will always be crowned with success.

It may happen that, owing to a variety of reasons, other activities in which Catholics laudably engage do not always achieve the results which had been hoped for; but whatever is done in the field of charity is never lost—in fact it all converges in mysterious ways toward those ends which are dearest to Our heart. Contemplate once again your standard-bearer, Frederic Ozanam. What multiple activities in his life that was consecrated to the Church! He was a writer, orator, professor, scholar and also a politician. What intense activity in a life of forty years! And yet, which was the work that made him most illustrious if not the Conferences which he founded?

There is, moreover, a field of action in which the activity of the Conferences can make a direct contribution toward those objectives which We have frequently stated, namely, the field of social assistance. In this field you can render service while still adhering strictly to your institution, which, as you well know, intends to further every work that aims at promoting social justice and at improving the conditions of the poorer classes. Thus you must not consider as being outside your scope activities such as assistance to workers, schools for adult education, employment bureaus, provision of housing, summer camps for children, and other forms of social assistance which the youthful spirit of the Conferences will suggest to you.

Beloved sons and daughters! Divine Providence has been generous with you in inspiring you to join the Conferences of Saint Vincent, because therein it offers you an incomparable means of sanctification, of apostolate and of social action. In like manner let you be generous in corresponding thereto, with the certainty of obtaining marvelous fruits for yourselves and for the Church.

Point out to others your program: to the youth, who sometimes seek in vain a noble purpose in life, and to those who, deluded by other ideals, feel in themselves and in their surroundings an immense emptiness. Stand together, faithful and united under the banners of Christian charity. Work diligently and with humility. Penetrate, with the meekness of Christ, into the hovels of misery and misfortune to bring there that Saviour Who walked upon this earth healing and doing good. The warmth of that Divine Heart, first established in your own souls, will thus be radiated on a world of egoism and coldness and will be the salvation of many.

That these Our wishes may be fulfilled in you and through you, with all Our heart We impart to you here present and to all those associated throughout the world to the Conferences of Saint Vincent de Paul Our paternal Apostolic Benediction.

Function of Art

HIS HOLINESS, PIUS XII

Address to a group of Italian artists received in audience April 8, 1952.

WITH deep satisfaction, beloved sons and daughters, promoters of the figurative arts, We welcome your devout homage and that of your families, by reason of your coming to Us on the occasion of the sixth Roman quadrennial meeting, and We express to you Our pleasure for the remembrance-gift which you are leaving with Us.

How delightful your presence is to Us is shown by the tradition itself of the Roman pontificate. As the heir of universal culture it has never ceased to appreciate art, to surround itself with works of art, to make art, within due limits, the collaborator of its divine mission, preserving and elevating its destiny, which is to guide the soul to God.

Upon crossing the threshold of this house of the common Father, you felt as though you were in your own world, perceiving yourselves and your ideals in the masterpieces gathered here throughout the centuries. Nothing is lacking, therefore, to make this meeting mutually delightful between the Successor, though unworthy, of those Pontiffs who shone as generous patrons of the arts, and you who continue the Italian artistic tradition.

It is needless to explain to you—who feel it within yourselves, often as a noble torment—one of the essential characteristics of art, which consists in a certain intrinsic “affinity” of art with religion, which in certain ways renders artists interpreters of the infinite perfections of God, and particularly of the beauty and harmony of God’s creation.

The function of all art lies in fact in breaking through the narrow and tortuous enclosure of the finite, in which man is immersed while living here below, and in providing a window on the infinite for his hungry soul.

Thus it follows that any effort—and it would be a vain one, indeed—aimed at denying or suppressing any relation between art and religion must impair art itself. Whatever artistic beauty one may wish to grasp in the world, in nature and in man, in order to express it in sound, in color, or in

plays for the masses, such beauty cannot prescind from God. Whatever exists is bound to Him by an essential relationship. Hence, there is not, neither in life nor in art—be it intended as an expression of the subject or as an interpretation of the object—the exclusively “human,” the exclusively “natural” or “immanent.”

The greater the clarity with which art mirrors the infinite, the divine, the greater will be its possibility for success in striving toward its ideal and true artistic accomplishment. Thus, the more an artist lives religion, the better prepared he will be to speak the language of art, to understand its harmonies, to communicate its emotions.

Naturally, We are far from thinking that in order to be interpreters of God in the sense just mentioned, artists must treat explicitly religious subjects. On the other hand, one cannot question the fact that never, perhaps, has art reached its highest peaks as it has in these subjects.

In this manner, the great masters of Christian art became interpreters not only of the beauty, but also of the goodness of God, the Revealer and Redeemer. Marvelous exchange of services between Christianity and art! From their faith they drew sublime inspirations. They drew hearts to the faith when for continuous centuries they communicated and spread the truths contained in the Holy Scriptures, truths inaccessible, at least directly, to the humble people.

“BIBLE OF THE PEOPLE”

In truth, artistic masterpieces were known as the “Bible of the people,” to mention such noted examples as the windows of Chartres, the door of Ghiberti (by happy expression known as the Door of Paradise), the Roman and Ravenna mosaics and the facade of the Cathedral of Orvieto. These and other masterpieces not only translate into easy reading and universal language the Christian truths; they also communicate the intimate sense and emotion of these truths with an effectiveness, lyricism and ardor that, perhaps, is not contained in even the most fervent preaching.

Souls ennobled, elevated and prepared by art—are thus better disposed to receive the religious truths and the grace of Jesus Christ. This is one of the reasons why the Sovereign Pontiffs, and the Church in general, honored and continue to honor art and to offer its works as a tribute of human beings to God's Majesty in His churches, which have always been abodes of art and religion at the same time.

Beloved children, crown your artistic ideals with those of religion, which revitalize and integrate them. The artist is of himself a privileged person among men, but the Christian artist is, in a certain sense, a chosen one, because it is proper to those chosen to contemplate, to enjoy and to express God's perfections.

Seek God here below in nature and in man, but above all within yourselves. Do not vainly try to give the human without the divine, nor nature without its Creator. Harmonize instead the finite with the infinite, the temporal with the eternal, man with God, and thus you will give the truth of art and the true art.

Even without making it a specific aim, endeavor to educate men's hearts—so easily inclined toward materialism—toward kindness and a spiritual feeling—you to whom it is given to speak a language which all peoples can understand. Strive to bring men closer to one another. May the artist's vocation, for which you are indebted to God, lead you to this mission: a mission so noble and worthy that it is sufficient in itself to give to your daily life—often harsh and arduous—its fullness and a courageous faith.

In order that these Our wishes may be fulfilled and God glorified in your art, We invoke upon you and your families an abundance of heavenly favors and may the Apostolic Blessing which We impart upon you from the fullness of Our heart be a promise of them.

On Sacred Art

*Instruction to Bishops issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office,
June 30, 1952.*

IT IS the function and duty of sacred art, by reason of its very definition, to enhance the beauty of the house of God and to foster the faith and piety of those who gather in the church to assist at the divine service and to implore heavenly favors. Wherefore sacred art has always been cultivated by the Church with assiduous care and vigilant interest in order that it might be in complete harmony with its own proper laws, which stem from supernatural doctrine and true asceticism and thereby rightly vindicate for itself the title "sacred."

Consequently the words which the Supreme Pontiff, Blessed Pius X, uttered when promulgating the wise norms concerning sacred music are truly appropriate to this subject:

Nothing therefore should have place in the church which disturbs or even merely diminishes the piety and devotion of the faithful, nothing which might reasonably be considered in bad taste or cause of scandal, nothing above all which . . . might be unworthy of the house of prayer and the majesty of God."¹

Wherefore in the early history of the Church the Second Council of Nicea, by condemning the heresy of the Iconoclasts, confirmed the cult of sacred images and threatened with severe penalties those who dared "to wickedly invent anything contrary to ecclesiastical institution."²

The Council of Trent in its 25th session issued prudent laws concerning Christian iconography and concluded its serious exhortation to Bishops with these words:

Finally let Bishops exercise such diligence and care concerning these matters that nothing distorted may meet the eye, nothing distorted and confused in execution, nothing unbecoming and unbecoming, since sanctity belongs to the house of God."³

In order that the decree of the Council of Trent concerning sacred

¹Motu Proprio *Tra le sollecitudini*, 22 Nov. 1903; Acta Pii X, vol. 1, p. 75.

²Actio 7^a et ultima definitio Synodi II^{ae}, Mansi, Sac. Conc., XIII, col. 730.

³Sess. XXV, De invocatione, vener, et Reliquiis Sanct. et sacris Imaginibus.

images be faithfully executed, Urban VIII added appropriate norms, affirming: "Let those objects which are exposed to the gaze of the faithful be neither disordered nor unusual in appearance, and let them engender devotion and piety."⁴

Finally the Code of Canon Law gathers all the legislation of the Church on sacred art under summary headings (Can. 485, 1161, 1162, 1164, 1178, 1261, 1268, 1269 #1, 1279, 1280, 1385, 1399).

Worthy of explicit mention are the prescriptions of Canon 1261, which obliges Ordinaries to vigilance, "especially lest anything be admitted into divine worship which is foreign to the faith or not in harmony with ecclesiastical tradition"; and also Canon 1399, 12° which "prohibits by the law itself images, no matter how produced, which are foreign to the mind and decrees of the Church."

Recently the Apostolic See reprobated corrupt and errant forms of sacred art. Of no moment are the objections raised by some that sacred art must be adapted to the necessities and conditions of the present times. For sacred art, which originated with Christian society, possesses its own ends, from which it can never diverge, and its proper function, which it can never desert. Wherefore Pius XI of happy memory inaugurated the new Vatican Gallery of Paintings with a discourse on sacred art. Having recalled the so-called "new art," he added these momentous words:

With masters of art and with Holy Pontiffs we have already many times expressed the thought that Our hope, Our ardent desire, Our will can only be that the law of the Church be obeyed, so clearly formulated and sanctioned in the Code of Canon Law; that is, that such art be not admitted into our churches, and all the more that it be not called upon to construct, to remodel or to decorate them; rather open wide the portals and tender sincere welcome to every good and progressive development of the approved and venerable traditions, which in so many centuries of Christian life, in such diversity of circumstances and of social and ethnic conditions, have given stupendous proof of their inexhaustible capacity of inspiring new and beautiful forms, as often as they were investigated, or studied and cultivated under the twofold light of genius and faith.⁵

Recently Pius XII, now happily reigning, in the encyclical letter "On the Sacred Liturgy" (November 20, 1947), concisely and clearly formulated the duties of Christian art:

It is eminently fitting that the art of our times have a free opportunity to serve the sacred edifices and sacred rites with due reverence and with due honor; so that it too may add its voice to the magnificent hymn of glory which men of high talent have sung throughout the passing centuries of the Catholic Faith. Nevertheless in consciousness of Our office We cannot but deplore and reprove those images and forms recently introduced by some which seem to be deformations and debasements of sane art, and which at times are even in open contradiction to Christian grace, modesty and piety, and miserably offend true religious sentiment; these indeed are to be totally excluded and expelled from our churches

⁴Sacrosancta Tridentina, # 1, die XV mensis Martii anno MDCXLII, Bullarium Romanum, Taurinen. editio, XV, 171.

⁵Sermo diei 27 Oct. 1932, A.A.S., XXIV (1932), p. 356.

as "in general whatever is out of harmony with the holiness of the place" (Can. 1178).⁶

After attentively considering all these points, this Supreme Sacred Congregation, deeply anxious to preserve the faith and piety of the Christian people through sacred art, has decreed that the following rules should be recalled to the attention of the Ordinaries throughout the world, in order that the forms and methods of sacred art may fully correspond to the beauty and holiness of God's house.

CONCERNING ARCHITECTURE

Sacred architecture, although it may adopt new styles, cannot in any way be equated with profane building, but must always perform its own office, which regards the house of God and the house of prayer. In addition, in building churches care should be had of the convenience of the faithful, so that they can take part in the divine offices with a better view and better attention; let new churches be resplendent also for the simple beauty of their lines, abhorring all deceitful adornment; but still everything that savors of a neglect of art or of a want of pains should be avoided.

In Can. 1162, #1, warning is given "that no Church shall be built without the express consent in writing of the Ordinary of the place, which cannot be given by the Vicar General without a special mandate."

In Can. 1164, #1: "Ordinaries shall see to it, taking counsel of experts if need be, that in the construction and remodeling of churches traditional Christian styles of architecture and the laws of sacred art be observed."

This Supreme Sacred Congregation strictly enjoins that the prescriptions of Cc. 1268, #2 and 1269, #1 be religiously observed: "The most Blessed Eucharist should be kept in the most distinguished and honorable place in the church, and hence as a rule at the main altar unless some other be considered more convenient and suitable for the veneration and worship due to so great a Sacrament. . . . The most Blessed Eucharist must be kept in an immovable tabernacle set in the middle of the altar."

ABOUT DESCRIPTIVE ART

1. According to the prescription of Can. 1279: "No one may place or cause to be placed in churches, even though they be exempt, or in other sacred places, any unusual image, unless it has been approved by the Ordinary of the place."

2. "And the Ordinary shall not approve of images to be exposed publicly for the veneration of the faithful, if they are not in conformity with the approved usage of the Church" (#2).

3. "The Ordinary shall never permit to be shown in churches or other sacred places, images which represent a false dogma, or which are not sufficiently decent and moral, or which would be an occasion of dangerous error to the unlearned" (#3).

4. If there are lacking experts on the diocesan commissions, or doubts

⁶A.A.S., XXXIX (1947), p. 590 s.

or controversies arise, let the local Ordinaries consult the metropolitan commissions or the Roman Commission on Sacred Art.

5. According to the norm of canons 485 and 1178, the Ordinaries should see to it that everything is removed from sacred buildings which is in any way contrary to the holiness of the place and the reverence due to the house of God; and let them severely forbid second-rate and stereotyped statues and effigies to be multiplied, and improperly and absurdly exposed to the veneration of the faithful on the altars themselves or on the neighboring walls of the chapels.

6. Let bishops and religious superiors refuse permission to edit books, papers or periodicals in which there are printed pictures foreign to the sentiment and decrees of the Church (cf. Can. 1385 and 1399, 12°).

In order that the local Ordinaries may more safely demand and receive from the Diocesan Commission for Sacred Art advice which is in perfect harmony with the prescriptions of the Apostolic See and the end of sacred art itself, they should see to it themselves that those appointed to the Commission are not only experts in art but also firmly adhere to the Christian faith, have been brought up to piety, and gladly follow the precise principles defined by ecclesiastical authority.

And works of painting, sculpture and architecture should be entrusted for their execution only to men who are outstanding for their technique, and who are capable of expressing sincere faith and piety, which is the purpose of any sacred art.

Finally, care should be taken that aspirants to sacred orders in schools of philosophy and theology be educated in sacred art and formed to its appreciation, in a way adapted to the ability and age of each one, by masters who reverence what our ancestors cherished and established and comply with the prescriptions of the Holy See.

Given at Rome, from the Sacred Office, on June 30, 1952.

JOSEPH CARD. PIZZARDO, *Secretary*
Alaphridus Ottaviani, *Assessor*

Labor Day Statement, 1952

*Issued by the Social Action Department, NCWC**

LABOR DAY should be Church Day for everyone. We should thank Al-mighty God for the blessings He has bestowed upon our beloved America. We should thank Him for the kind of Labor Day we have and ask Him to make Labor Day one of dedication to Him and to our fellowman. At home or away, let us go to church and make it a day of prayer.

Back in the eighties and nineties when Labor Day was in the process of becoming a holiday, "labor" was the term for manual workers of the skilled trades and the so-called unskilled workers. Since Labor Day be-

* 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C.

came a legal holiday, great changes have occurred. The mass production workers are now a large part of labor. Clerical workers and sales people consider themselves more and more a part of "labor." Management itself has become largely an employee in the shift from owner-managers to shareholders. These changes have made nearly all of us "labor," including a large part of the professional people.

There is another factor that changes the nature of Labor Day now. There has been enormous improvement in the attitude of all Americans since Labor Day was made a legal holiday. Labor Day now is more a day of hope and of resolves than one of protest. Nevertheless we must be mindful of the fact that there still remain some basic defects in American economic life.

White-collar workers have not organized enough to protect themselves, and Federal and State laws give them little protection. There remains the perennial American problem of how to prevent discrimination in employment, particularly against Negroes and Mexicans. While the hours of work have been reduced, "speed-up" has been increased in some industries beyond all reasonable consideration.

There remains, also, the problem of how the union in the single plant and throughout a whole industry can be not only a protective organization but one which works together with management for the general welfare of the company, the industry and the country. There is a marked improvement in the attitude of management towards their co-workers farther down the line. The credit is due not only to the unions and to legislation; management itself has voluntarily cooperated. We ask management to work continually with cooperative unions in the plant and the industry and the country as a whole. We ask the unions to strive earnestly for such cooperation.

Cooperation of labor and management is important now. Our country is supporting two economies, one of war and one of peace. Wholehearted cooperation is necessary for present purposes. But if the economy of war ends, prevention of unemployment within a single economy of peace will require cooperation to the utmost. This joint future action demands immediate attention. Labor-management cooperative action, put into effect now, helps to insure the present and future economy of our country.

Labor Day is a kind of All-American Social Justice Day. It is a day that should draw us up short and make us examine our conscience. Is there greed in us? Is there hatred in us? Do we work with others? Do we do our work well and to the best of our ability? Do we pay justly? Do we charge justly? Do we do what is necessary for the common good? Do we always keep the welfare of America in mind? Do we love our neighbor as ourselves? Are we good human beings? Good Christians?

Labor Day is a Social Justice Day because of two facts of human nature. One is the great worth of the individual. We are made in the image and likeness of God. We can think. We have will power. Christ our Lord came down to redeem us. If we do not carry our personal dignity into so important a part of our live as our work, we are demeaned.

We also depend on one another. We are extraordinarily important individuals; but we are interdependent by our very nature. That interdependence is ennobled by kinship: we are children of One Father, and we have an adopted sonship through Christ, our Brother. We are born to be brothers. Either we carry that Spirit of brotherhood into our work or we are demeaned, and so are others.

Born to work under conditions good for body and soul, and born to be brothers, we should make Labor Day a holy day dedicated to individual dignity, human brotherhood and human welfare. May God Who made us as we are and Christ Who showed us our dignity and brotherhood help us to dedicate Labor Day to man's dignity and man's brotherhood—a dignity and a brotherhood that come from our kinship with God, confirmed and heightened by Christ, Our Lord.



Entertainment Unlimited

Once-serious papers today headline the tantrums of some skating star or the marital infidelities of a Hollywood diva. Radio stations drift more and more in their program selections to the lowest common denominator of general entertainment to keep maximum audiences for the next "commercial"! It is a rare event when movies combine good entertainment with educational and cultural influence. All these media of communication, which should be used also for communication of thought, are turning more and more to an escapism from the problems of the day lest people forsake them for "better entertainment."

Numbers do count in reaching markets for sales. But the theme that only numbers count is an insult to the tastes of women and an indictment of the false standards of our country.

As the means of communication are constantly improving, so the necessity of using them to do a better job of information becomes more and more important. —THE ENSIGN, *Montreal, P.Q., Canada*, May 24, 1952.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.